FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 015 22 January 1980

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/SALT/MBFR

'Rapid' Disarmament Progress Possible if NATO Upgrading Shelved AA 1
[Portugalov in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 9 Jan]
Zamyatin Stresses Value of European Military Detente AA 6
[Hamburg DPA]
Kekkonen Comments on Northern European Security AA 7
[Andreyev]
SALT Treaty Fell Victim to 'Absurd Incidents' AA 8
[Anichkin]
NATO Countries Should See U.S. as 'Unreliable' Partner AA 9
[Portugalov]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

PRAVDA Review on New Carter 'Doctrine of Aggression' CC 1
[Maslennikov, 20 Jan]
Christopher Trip, European Reaction, Iranian Situation Viewed CC 5
[Petko]
UN Issues Letter to Carter From Taraki's Widow CC 8

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Embassy Bugging Seen Aimed at 'Blackmail' of Soviet Citizens A 1
[Antonov in IZVESTIYA 19 Jan]
Comment on Carter Call for Moscow Olympics Boycott A 2
Demand Clearly Political [Goncharov] A 2
Zagladin: 'Premediated Act' [Paris AFP] A 4
Athletes Opposition to Boycott Call [Dmitriyev] A 5
Other Opposition to Boycott A 6
'Carter Doctrine' of Aggression Predates Afghan, Iranian Events A 7
[Losev in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 19 Jan]
Zhukov Article 'On Morbid Sanctions Syndrome' A 9
[PRAVDA 18 Jan]
Anichkin Claims Afghan Events Excuse for SALT, Sanctions A 12
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSKIYA 18 Jan]
Articles Criticize U.S. Reaction, Position of Afghanistan A 14
Beglov Interview [Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO 15 Jan] A 14
Administration-Orchestrated Campaign A 16
[Repin in TRUD 15 Jan]
Sisnev Review [TRUD 15 Jan] A 17
Zorin Comments on 'Rash' U.S. Reactions to Afghan Events A 19
Failure To Service Aeroflot Plane at New York Noted A 21
IZVESTIYA Ridicules U.S. Claim To 'Defend Islam' in Iran A 21
[Zubko in IZVESTIYA 20 Jan]

U.S., British Naval Activity in Persian Gulf Reported A 22
Indian Ocean Build Up 'Threat' to USSR's Security A 23
[Rostarchuk in IZVESTIYA 17 Jan]
Initialing of U.S.-Turkey Agreements on Bases Observed A 24

CHINA

Political Officer Says PRC-USSR Border Situation 'Tense' B 1
Glebov Commentary: Brown Sabotaged Soviet-Chinese Talks B 1
Losev Hits Beijing Policy as 'Narrowminded Nationalism' B 2
Yakovlev Criticizes PRC Mideast, South Asia Moves B 3

NORTHEAST ASIA

U.S.-Japanese Plans for 'Pacific Community' Threatens Peace C 1
[IZVESTIYA]
Soviet, DPRK Deputy Premiers Hold Talks C 3

SOUTH ASIA

Foreign Minister Dost Supports Soviet Action in Afghanistan D 1
Afghan Security Official on Presence of Soviet Troops D 1
Kabul Paper Cited on Expulsion of U.S. Journalists D 1
Correspondents Report 'Peaceful' Afghan Capital D 2
[Seyful-Mulyukov, Basilevich]
Afghan Government Releases Pakistani Prisoners 'To Show Good Will' D 2
Egyptian, PRC Cooperation Noted; Indian Paper Cited D 2
Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee Welcomes Afghans' Victory D 3
PRC Foreign Minister's Pakistan Visit Viewed as 'Instigatory' D 3
Journalists Interview Indira Gandhi on Relations With USSR D 4

EASTERN EUROPE

Yugoslav-USSR Cooperation Belies Claims of Soviet Threat F 1
[Nikolayev]
Rusakov Addresses Bulgarian CP Conference on Party Ties F 2
[PRAVDA 17 Jan]
Zhivkov Presents Order of Dimitrov to Rusakov F 3
[PRAVDA 17 Jan]
Patolichev, Bulgarian Foreign Trade Minister Discuss Economic Ties F 3
[IZVESTIYA 15 Jan]
Ustinov Greets Jaruzelski on Warsaw Liberation Anniversary F 3
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jan]

WESTERN EUROPE

French National Assembly Chairman Arrives in Moscow G 1
Kozlov Commentary G 1
France, USSR Sign Cinematography Protocol G 2
Ponomarev Meets with Belgian CP Delegation G 2
Cunhal Supports Soviet Position on Afghanistan G 2
Brezhnev Sends Congratulations to New Swiss President G 2

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Tudeh Party Paper Calls for 'Revolutionary Vigilance' H 1
Revolution Guards Ordered To Move From Iranian Kurdish Towns H 1
Iran-American Society in Shiraz Closed H 1
PDRY, USSR Sign Protocol on Goods Exchange for 1980 H 2
Conference of Solidarity With Arabs Ends; Statement Adopted H 2

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Vanguard Workers Party Needed in Ethiopia J 1
[Kostin]
Commentator Discusses 'Socialist-Oriented' African States J 1
[Kosugin]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

CPSU Central Committee Letter Lists Candidates, Constituencies R 1
Brezhnev, Kosygin Candidacy Registration R 2
Brezhnev Speech R 3
Kirillin Relieved of Supreme Soviet Presidium Duties R 4
Nikolayev Appointed Ukraine Ministers Council Deputy Chairman R 4
[PRAVDA UKRAINY 15 Jan]
Burmistrov Retirement [PRAVDA UKRAINY 15 Jan] R 5
New Kazakh Minister of Internal Affairs Appointed R 5
Background to Uzbek Forestry Minister's Dismissal Reported R 5
[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 4 Jan]
Armenian SSR Supreme Court Discusses Juvenile Crime Issues R 6
[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 11 Jan]
Late Report: Sakharov Deprived of Titles, Arrest Rumored R 6

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

PRAVDA Appeals for Greater Efficiency in Power Industry S 1
[Editorial, 11 Jan]
PRAVDA Calls for Management Reform in Construction Sector S 2
[Editor, 17 Jan]
Party, State Leaders Attend Capital Construction Conference S 4
Grishin Addresses Moscow Meeting on Socialist Competition S 5
Grishin Attends Moscow Conference on Energy Conservation S 6
Romanov Attends Leningrad Aktiv Meeting on 1980 Plan Targets S 6
IZVESTIYA Views Problems in Siberian River Transport S 6
[Drachev, Levitskiy, 13 Jan]

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Radio Reports Agricultural Developments for 18-20 January T 1
18 January T 1
20 January T 1
Official Interviewed on Long-Term Credits for State Farms T 1

Solomontsev Speaks at RSFSR Agriculture Ministry Collegium T 2
Florentyrev Interview T 3
Higher Output Discussion T 3
PRAVDA Editorial Outlines Tasks for Rural Workers [9 Jan] T 3

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Plekhov Summarizes USSR Defense Policy V 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Jan]
Air Force Council Stresses Political, Labor Activeness V 3
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jan]
Month of Mass Defense Work Begins V 3

'RAPID' DISARMAMENT PROGRESS POSSIBLE IF NATO UPGRADING SHELVED

LD210957 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 9 Jan 80 p 14 LD

[Nikolay Portugalov article: "At a Dangerous Crossroads"]

[Text] The decision of the Brussels NATO session heralds the start of a new round of the arms race that the West, as in the previous postwar decades, is again foisting on the Soviet Union and the socialist countries now, at the start of the eighties. But never before have decisions like this been accompanied by such a flood of honeyed talk of detente and the strengthening of peace. The Atlantic leaders are trying to present their notorious "two-track scenario" of "arms upgrading plus talks," their superb formula of "arming in order to disarm"--a cartoonist's delight--as a patent medicine making it possible to avert the transition to a new twist in the arms spiral. The NATO Santa Claus has followed the established bad tradition by hanging another nuclear present on Europe's Christmas tree, but this time he has taken particular care to wrap it in colorful paper.

Virtually every day calls are issued from the Atlantic capitals for the Soviet Union to "display a serious approach to the West's constructive proposals," "insure a decrease in the level of confrontation on this basis" and, in the expression of FRG Foreign Minister Genscher, thereby "make the eighties the decade of arms control." The "confidence" is expressed that "Moscow, despite the tough stance it has initially adopted," will nevertheless "think again" and embark on talks following the Western scheme, while the credo of political reason--"there is no alternative to detente"--is repeated thoughtlessly like the "amen" after a prayer even though, in this context, it sounds downright blasphemous.

Leading politicians in the West European NATO countries are posing as magi bringing the gifts of detente to a grateful mankind, while President Carter, in a speech to American businessmen the day after the alliance's Brussels session ends, announces a 5-year military program that essentially signifies nothing other than a claim to world hegemony and a course leading to the resumption of cold war according to the prescriptions of the fifties, only at an incomparably higher and more dangerous level of political confrontation. (Incidentally, I wonder whether the West European countries knew during the winter NATO session that the U.S. President was preparing to make a speech like that? Bonn perhaps knew. It is hardly likely that the others did....)

Atlantic propaganda has now been set thankless tasks that it will find extremely difficult to solve, despite unlimited funds and highly efficient machinery for disorienting the public: to disguise the fact that the United States and the NATO elite essentially do not want any disarmament talks and that the Americans are seeking to upset the prevailing global balance of forces in their own favor, to the detriment of West Europe's security and, to a considerable extent, using its money; to conceal the fact that Washington's true motives are to usurp the right to intervene by force wherever it deems "its interests affected" and to continue to appropriate the lion's share of the diminishing world reserves of energy and other raw materials. It is certainly not easy now, after the U.S. Vietnamese adventure, to hide all that from broad strata of the West European public. But it will be even more difficult to blame the Soviet Union for the exacerbation of tension and growth of armaments that will inevitably result from the deployment of the new American medium-range nuclear missile systems in Europe.

It is not easy to expunge from the memory of West Europe's peoples such radical Soviet initiatives in the military detente sphere as the proposal put forward by L.I. Brezhnev last March that a nonaggression pact be concluded between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries, or the Soviet Union's readiness, which he expressed in October in Berlin, to reduce--within an overall balance--the number of medium-range weapons in our country's western regions on the sole condition that NATO forgo additional deployment on our continent of similar U.S. systems. Given a minimum of good will, these proposals ought to have dispelled from the mind of any unbiased European all idea of the imaginary "Soviet threat." And there was nothing left for NATO to do but hush them up or reject them out of hand, without looking into the essence of the matter.

That is why the Atlanticists in Europe are now posing as peacemakers and champions of military detente. In the last decade West Europe's peoples have become accustomed to regarding detente and its benefits as both an integral part of their existence and the guarantee of every conceivable improvement in the future. That is the positive result of international development in the seventies.

The Soviet Union proposed that talks on medium-range weapons be started immediately, independently of any other arms reduction and limitation talks already being held. During such talks all participants could have put forward any proposals and directly defended their own interests. The decision adopted by NATO in Brussels cut the ground out from under those talks and destroyed the very basis for them. Henceforth the honest and, for West Europe, extremely promising talks on medium-range weapons that the Soviet Union proposed will have to be classed among the considerable number of opportunities already wasted by the European NATO countries in the detente process.

Just what is being presented as the new, allegedly so "constructive" basis for talks on medium-range weapons which NATO is offering us? To see for yourself its complete untenability, you only have to look at the communique of the alliance's Brussels session. Incidentally, it is a long time since the Atlantic bloc has adopted such an Americanized document; despite the routine nods in the direction of detente, you get the impression that the paper was simply dictated to the NATO ministers by Brzezinski and other American "hawks." It is exceedingly unceremonious and shameless. It retains no trace even of the dubious figleaves that the leaders of West German Social Democracy used as cover for the future NATO decision at their last congress: There is not a word to the effect that "there must be no automatic link" between producing the new American missiles and deploying them in Europe; there is no mention, either, of the timetable for their deployment and the "3 or 4 years" still left for reaching agreement. And what about the terminological hybrid "long-range tactical weapons (or theater weapons)," which is what, after the American fashion, continental strategic systems are called in the communique! What is for the Americans a tactical class of weapon is for Europe the instrument of absolutely the most complete "strategic" destruction.

The communique merely indicates that the United States graciously consents to talk with the Soviet Union about medium-range weapons within the framework of the coming SALT III negotiations (thus right from the outset the West European NATO countries are debarred from participating in the talks and will have to content themselves with "collective consultations"). People may say that even this is a step forward, because previously the Americans repeatedly rejected Soviet suggestions that the issue of NATO forward-based systems and medium-range weapons be considered within the SALT context. But that argument does not hold water.

First of all, it is completely unacceptable to propose that the agenda of those talks be expanded now that, after the SALT II treaty's long wanderings in the labyrinths of the American Senate, a decision by President Carter has postponed the treaty's ratification indefinitely--something that reflects the extreme "hardening" of American policy. [paragraph continues]

(It is typical that, while before the Brussels NATO session the coming decision was presented to Europeans as an incentive to and even the guarantee of U.S. Senate ratification of the SALT II treaty, there is absolutely no mention of that now.)

Next, as is well known, according to the definition accepted by the sides, the subject of the SALT II talks will be intercontinental strategic armaments. The inclusion of weapons of another class in these talks would alter the concept of the talks agreed by the great powers.

But even that was not enough. On U.S. orders NATO equipped its proposal with a whole series of preliminary conditions that the Soviet Union would not accept even if the issue of medium-range weapons could be "dragged into" SALT III. For instance, what about the "autocratic" statement that the subject of the talks on long-range tactical systems within the SALT III framework "must be the ground-based American and Soviet systems of such weapons." Therefore, NATO is essentially agreeing to talk only about the 572 new missile launchers that it intends additionally to deploy in Europe, thus disrupting the established equilibrium on the continent, in exchange for the Soviet systems already deployed there and counted within the overall balance.

But what is to become of, for instance, the existing NATO forward-based systems on the seas around Europe? Why are the national medium-range weapons of Britain and France removed from consideration because the countries refuse to include them in the talks?

The aforementioned conditions alone attest that "NATO's disarmament proposals" are in fact merely a means of evading talks on medium-range systems, in complete accordance with U.S. hegemonist plans.

And furthermore, all this is set forth in a tone of diktat: "The Soviet Union must..."; "must, must, must." Only it is unclear just what the United States itself must do.

In our view, it "must" at last accustom itself to the idea that the Lord God by no means guaranteed it the right to be the strongest in the world, to get rich at others' expense and to interfere in others' affairs wherever it sees fit, and that, like it or not, the country will have to tolerate and come to terms with Soviet-American parity. No, gentlemen, if the Soviet Union and the socialist countries must do anything after that NATO decision, it is to take retaliatory measures to restore the disrupted equilibrium and to prevent the NATO bloc from creating positions of military superiority for itself. As A.A. Gromyko stressed, if anyone is expecting to negotiate with the Soviet Union "from a position of strength," let him abandon those empty hopes. So the endless arguments that the Soviet Union will eventually embark on talks on the West's terms are an attempt to disorient, to mollify and to distract the West European public from throughts of the unenviable fate of a nuclear target, which is in store for West Europe under the new American doctrine of "limited nuclear war at regional level." And regarding the fact the new U.S. and NATO plans also have, so to speak, a double side effect, all that can be said here is that by dragging West Europe into the arms race the Americans, first, are depriving it of a considerable amount of political independence by "tying" it to the "raw material wars" they plan; and, second, are jeopardizing its relative economic stability.

This assessment of NATO's proposals as a method of avoiding any talks on controlling disarmament [as published] cannot be influenced, either, by the "initiatives" NATO has put forward in other areas of military detente.

Thus even an initial acquaintance with NATO's "Vienna package," which is the substitute for a direct reply to the series of proposals previously made by the socialist countries in the Hofburg Palace, makes it clear that here too the West is pursuing the aim of securing one-sided military advantages (the result of all of this is the withdrawal of only 13,000 American soldiers from the "reductions zone" in exchange for 30,000 Soviet soldiers, not counting the 20,000 that the Soviet Union is unilaterally withdrawing; the refusal to adopt clear commitments regarding the second stage of reductions; and so forth). But even that is not the main point here: The deployment of the new American missiles in West Europe could jeopardize the whole previously elaborated concept of the Vienna talks, and also the achievement of further measures to strengthen confidence in the all-European context.

In this connection I would like to dwell on yet another matter whose consequences are causing concern. In his speech at the reception for the People's Republic of Angola delegation A.A. Gromyko noted that "the most active role in implementing the sinister NATO plans is assigned to those whose armies, within the our generation's memory, committed aggression against many European countries and sowed death and destruction throughout the continent." This warning, which the left-liberal coalition in the FRG tries to keep quiet or brush aside, reflects a grim reality. West Germany's policy acquires new features after the NATO decisions--to be more precise, the elements of its course in the fifties and sixties that Europe managed to abandon in the seventies.

In commenting on the Brussels NATO decision the West German leaders particularly stress that the outcome is "extremely satisfactory," despite the reservation of Belgium and the Netherlands, which, they say, "are not of great importance" although they were treated with "due seriousness." It is also claimed that the FRG "has not been assigned a special role." Both these propositions are at variance with the actual situation.

The unconcern with which Bonn notes the serious reservations of the Belgians and the Dutch, just like the Scandinavians' "special opinion," in itself prompts caution. It is well known that during the preparation of the Brussels decision the FRG, along with the United States, exerted massive pressure on the economically minor NATO countries dependent on it (and not only the minor countries, if you include Italy among the waverers), using political and financial levers for this. And when, despite this, the basis of the adopted decision proved shaky, since the Dutch and Belgians refused to support it unconditionally while the Danes and Norwegians made no secret of their special opinion, the FRG declares their objections to be "of no importance." The ministers express themselves diplomatically, but the FRG "big press" feels no such constraint: DIE WELT calls the minor NATO countries "Trojan horses," while FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE calls them "political dwarfs."

This also reveals the misleading nature of the claims that the FRG will not have a special place among the countries where the new American missiles are to be deployed. In fact quite the reverse proves to be the case. It is no accident that the NEUE RUHR ZEITING, a newspaper close to the Social Democratic Party [SPD], writes that as a result of the Brussels decisions the Atlantic community's existence and viability are now almost exclusively dependent on the United States and the FRG, and wonders whether NATO is being replaced by a German-American alliance. The doubts and reservations of the Belgians, Dutch and Scandinavians in Brussels can be ascribed not least to misgivings about this development.

The "pangs of conscience" within the SPD, which has always been regarded as an opponent of German militarism, do nothing to change the line pursued by its representatives within the cabinet, who enjoy 100-percent support from the conservative opposition on this issue. The CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] representatives openly say what the left-liberal coalition's leaders are still embarrassed to admit. Thus Woerner, the CDU/CSU faction's defense expert, declared that the FRG must in everything unreservedly support the United States, on which not only its security but also oil and raw materials supplies depend!

Furthermore, during the preparation of the NATO decision Bonn tirelessly repeated that it would support it only on condition that the new American missiles were deployed in an least one other continental European country.

Otherwise, according to the West German leaders, the impression might be created that the FRG was laying claim to something like the status of a nuclear power. But it is precisely that impression that is being created now, if you take into account the fact that even in U.S. opinion the deployment of cruise missiles in Italy, with its domestic political instability, objectively remains in doubt. Incidentally, Strauss, the opposition candidate for chancellor, declares that if necessary the FRG will unhesitatingly accept American medium-range weapons, even if it finds itself the only country doing so. And the CDU/CSU may well return to power in the eighties, if not in the next Bundestag election then in the election after that. Any deterioration in the situation, any hitch in detente, benefits only the rightwingers in Western countries.

It is an open secret to the world press that the FRG military-industrial complex hopes to obtain access to the American technology for the Pershing II and cruise missiles during the implementation of the Brussels decisions. It must be assumed that these issues are already being discussed in the secret American-West German "working groups" whose existence was revealed recently by former FRG military intelligence officer E. Mueller at his press conference in the GDR capital.

We are faced with dangerous symptons of a relapse into the militarist FRG policy of the times of the Adenauer-Dulles "entente cordiale," when Bonn, assuming the role of "America's continental sword," gradually built up its military strength. But now this is happening in changed times--the FRG has achieved economic and political primacy in West Europe and is a power that lacks only its own nuclear missile potential in order to become militarily the mightiest also. The decisions of the Brussels NATO session enable it to take at least a step in that direction. And that cannot fail to alarm all the FRG's neighbors in both East and West. Having made the most active contribution to the adoption of the NATO arms upgrading plan, Bonn must now face up to the truth: This development of events cannot help having negative consequences for the relations between the FRG and the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

Right at the start of the eighties international development has brought the peoples to a dangerous historical crossroads. Having recovered from the Vietnam disaster without learning its lessons (according to President Carter, "not every intervention necessarily has to turn into a Vietnam"), the United States--leader of the Western system of alliances--is once again stating its claims to world hegemony and backing them up with appropriate steps and programs in the hope of overcoming mounting difficulties and contradictions, both of its own and of the entire imperialist system, through arms race and the aggravation of international tension. The military function of this Washington political course is the strategy of "limited regional nuclear wars" that would enable the United States, it hopes, to survive in the event of a nuclear conflict by exposing its allies--primarily in West Europe--to the danger. In this field the American "hawks" have obviously taken up and adapted to their own purposes some of the brainstorms of their new friends in Beijing. [paragraph continues]

The U.S. attempt to secure strategic superiority by deploying in the Old World medium-range nuclear missile systems capable of hitting targets deep in Soviet territory threatens a return to cold war.

So the question arises: Is that course of events inevitable? No, that is by no means an unavoidable fate. More than one path leads into the distance from every crossroads.

The dangers with which the new NATO and U.S. plans threaten Europe are so obvious and the Soviet Union's good will, desire for detente and readiness to go a long way toward meeting the West Europeans in arms control talks are so clear and incontestable that the broadest strata of the public of the European NATO countries, to say nothing of the continent's neutral states, are starting to oppose more and more resolutely the deployment of the Pershing II's and cruise missiles in their countries. In the minor NATO countries and to a considerable extent in Italy this is opposed not only by the public, but also by influential political forces, and in the FRG, whose government supported the Brussels decisions particularly energetically and unreservedly, the broad wave of protest provoked by this is growing.

And so it must be hoped that all the peoples of West Europe, and especially the European NATO countries, will prevent the "arms upgrading" plans from being implemented, just as they prevented the deployment of neutron weapons in their countries. By doing so they will create the conditions for rapid progress in military detente and for successful headway along the path of reaching agreement on arms control under conditions of equality and equal security--the path that the Soviet Union and the socialist countries have no intention of leaving.

ZAMYATIN STRESSES VALUE OF EUROPEAN MILITARY DETENTE

LD171302 Hamburg DPA in German 1139 GMT 17 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Bonn--Leonid Zamyatin, head of the CPSU Central Committee International Information Department, has affirmed the USSR's refusal to engage in parallel negotiations with the West on medium-range missiles and NATO's rearmament decisions. This is like putting a railroad engine on a track so that the wheels on the left side are turning in one direction and those on the right side in the opposite direction, Zamyatin said in an article in the Cologne journal BLAETTER FUER DEUTSCHE and INTERNATIONALE POLITIK which was pre-released by the periodical today.

"We are not prepared to conduct negotiations on such a basis," the Soviet official stressed. At the same time he accused Washington of forcing the world on to the "path of a stepped-up arms race and back to the period of the cold war." Without military detente a reliable normalization of the political climate in Europe would hardly be possible. In Europe an "approximate equilibrium of forces" emerged a long time ago. "We are not upsetting this equilibrium and do not intend to upset it." The United States and some of its allies who have decided to win military superiority should be aware, therefore, that their actions will not lead to military detente but to its opposite, Zamyatin added.

III. 22 Jan 80 AA 7 USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
DISARMAMENT/SALT/MBFR

KEKKONEN COMMENTS ON NORTHERN EUROPEAN SECURITY

ID191346 Moscow TASS in English 1322 GMT 19 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, January 19, TASS--TASS commentator Yuriy Andreyev writes:

The destinies of peace in the north of Europe have largely depended and will depend on how the situation is shaping in Europe and in the whole world. This cannot but be recalled now when after the decision taken by the December session of the NATO Council most acute became the question of how things will proceed further in Europe, will it be able to preserve the course of detente, mutual trust and peaceful cooperation.

Well-known politicians of north European countries repeatedly noted that the build-up of the arms race in the world creates a serious threat also for security in that part of Europe. President of Finland Urho Kaleva Kekkonen emphasized: "A new twist in the arms spiral...could imperil stability of the military-political situation in the north of Europe". The Government of Sweden pointed out that preservation of the over-all balance of forces in Europe and between the great powers is the decisive prerequisite for maintaining the present stability in the European north.

The great danger which comes from the United States-imposed NATO's decisions exactly is that deployment in Western Europe of new American medium-range atomic missiles would change the strategic situation, would upset the correlation of forces that established in Europe. It is clear that now that the NATO is trying to ensure itself military superiority in Europe the question arises of taking by the Soviet Union and its allies the necessary measures in order to ensure their security and restore the upset balance of forces.

There is no doubt that the decision of the December session of the NATO council, the Pentagon's "Eurostrategy" are a real threat to stability and tranquility that the peoples of northern Europe are striving for and that express the governments of their countries the desire to promote.

In this connection one can realize the anxiety which is being expressed in Finland and Sweden over a possible violation of their air space by American cruise-missiles. One can also understand the anxiety of the people of northern Europe, caused by plans of deployment of a considerable part of new types of nuclear-missile weapons on the territory of the FRG, i.e. in direct proximity of north European countries.

The pronouncements of some NATO politicians and generals to the effect that the policy, proclaimed by Norway and Denmark, of non-deployment on their territory of nuclear weapons and foreign military bases "grew outdated" and is "not in accordance" with the present military-strategic situation cannot but make one wary. It cannot be ruled out that the further drawing of these countries into military cooperation with NATO could lead to "erosion" of that policy which is a substantial contribution to the preservation of stable conditions in the north of Europe.

The new year speech by President Urho Kaleva Kekkonen has sounded weighty in the discussion which is now under way in north European countries on ways of ensuring security of the region in connection with the situation that arose after the NATO Council's session.

He emphasized that it is particularly important now to preserve such a situation that there should be no nuclear weapons in northern Europe. The president pointed to the invariability of Finland's foreign policy course. It is generally recognized that this course underlying which is the treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance with the Soviet Union of 1948 makes an important contribution to the preservation of peace in the north of Europe, and that the Soviet-Finnish treaty itself is an efficient obstacle on the way of those forces that would like to turn the development in that region in a different direction.

The Soviet Union has always believed that real ways of ensuring the security of northern Europe should be sought not in invigoration of the bloc-forming policy there. The joint efforts should be directed at looking for and finding such solutions that would accord with the objective interests of the peoples, that would serve the cause of peace.

SALT TREATY FELL VICTIM TO 'ABSURD INCIDENTS'

ID191356 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 19 Jan 80 LD

[Text] As is known, President Carter has postponed a Senate discussion on SALT II. Our news analyst Oleg Anichkin discusses the underlying reasons.

More than 7 long years of talks preceded the signing of SALT II. Several American administrations took part in discussing this highly important document. As official White House spokesmen said after the meeting in Vladivostok between the general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, Leonid Brezhnev, and the former president, Gerald Ford, agreement on SALT II was 95 percent sure. It was by far not because of the Soviet stand but just the signing of the agreement took another five years. The situation seemed strange even at the time when the chances for implementing the treaty were much better than they are now. Indeed, according to public opinion polls, the second accord between the USSR and the United States to limit strategic armaments had the support of a vast majority of the Americans. According to calculations by some American journalists Jimmy Carter himself spoke several dozen times for speedy ratification of SALT II. He stressed each time that the military experts and he himself believed that the accord would meet the national interests of the United States and (?was) greater security.

America's NATO partners in Western Europe emphasized on many occasions they were interested in the ratification of SALT II. The broad support for the treaty was due to the fact it meets not only the interests of our two nations but of all other nations of the world, the interest of further reducing international tensions.

What has changed now? Was it all a waste of time to discuss this treaty when the two sides showed an interest in and an understanding for one another's position, or is it possible that SALT II no longer meets the national interests of the United States? As Washington explains, the postponement of the treaty's ratification in the United States Senate is some sort of punishment on the Russians over the events in Afghanistan. But in doing so the White House shows the usual forgetfulness. Even recently President Carter and his closest aides said that SALT II was not a gift to the Russians but a reasonable compromise equally advantageous to both sides.

Then, to follow through the logic of punishing the Russians, the United States is punishing itself and other nations. But what actually matters is of course not the forgetfulness of the current Washington administration, and naturally not the events in Afghanistan. We may recall that following the signing of SALT II in Vienna certain quarters in the United States launched more active efforts to discredit the treaty. The long-suffering treaty was tied up in many things, with the Soviet conduct in Ethiopia and with the [word indistinct] attempts to accuse the Soviet Union of stepping up military activities in Cuba and with many other matters.

Prof Stanley Hoffmann of Harvard University said in this connection in the FOREIGN AFFAIRS journal that the treaty fell victim to absurd incidents. Terminology apart, the reasons for the postponement of the SALT II ratification lie in something else, I think. According to a fair remark in President Brezhnev's interview for the newspaper PRAVDA for some time now the leading quarters in the United States have been steering a course that is hostile to the cause of easing tensions, a course for whipping up the arms race that leads to a greater war danger. The beginning was made back in May 1978, when at a NATO Council session in Washington an endorsement was made for an automatic growth of military budgets of NATO decision, under American pressure, to deploy Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe.

Another display of America's rejection of the policy of easing tensions were decisions to develop new Trident 1 submarines, MX mobile missiles and B-1 bombers. The United States and its allies took all these measures to worsen military tension long before the Soviet Union came to the assistance of Afghanistan at the request of that country's lawful government in keeping with the treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan and strictly in accordance with the United Nations Charter. This point alone shows the apparent inconsistency of Washington's efforts to justify the freezing of SALT II by the events in Afghanistan. Postponement of SALT II ratification should be viewed exactly in the context of the new militaristic preparations of Washington. As Prof Stanley Hoffmann said in this connection. All this shows there is allegiance in the United States to a dictatorial style in international diplomacy and to a striving for strong bludgeons.

NATO COUNTRIES SHOULD SEE U.S. AS 'UNRELIABLE' PARTNER

LD191138 Moscow TASS in English 1034 GMT 19 Jan 80 LD

["Along a Dangerous Track"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, January 19, TASS--TASS news analyst Nikolay Portugalov writes:

During the preparation of the Brussels decision of NATO on the production of new U.S. nuclear missiles and on their deployment in Western Europe, the governments of the NATO member countries were busy repeating over and over again that the decision is nearly a guarantee of an earliest ratification of the SALT II treaty by the U.S. Senate. Later on, propagandising the already taken decision, the leaders of the European countries of NATO, the FRG, in the first place, announced in a jubilent chorus that not far off is another round of strategic arms limitation talks, SALT III, during which the great [word indistinct] medium-range means were not given ear to, as it were. West European countries of NATO also passed over in silence the Soviet viewpoint, which tolerates no false rumours and according to which to "attach" the question of medium-range means to SALT II talks the subject of which, by the definition of the sides, is exclusively intercontinental systems, would mean in practice a revision of their coordinated conception. In results talks on medium-range missiles would be postponed till Greek calends [time that will never arrive].

The above-mentioned considerations of the Soviet side were in proper time brought to the knowledge of the USA and NATO. But the matter here concerns another thing: In what position West European countries of NATO found themselves now that President Carter postponed ratification of the SALT II treaty for an indefinite time and thereby in point of fact ruled out a possibility of transition to SALT III talks in the foreseeable future.

Thus, the West European countries of NATO in the name of "Atlantic solidarity" and under the pressure of the USA as the leader of the alliance renounced, going against their own interests, the prospect of immediate and direct talks with the Soviet Union on medium-range means, the prospect which is very important for the destinies of the European Continent; by adopting decisions on deployment of medium-range missiles in their territories, they destroyed the very foundation for such talks and instead received "a bird in the bush"--the U.S. consent to include in SALT III the question of medium-range means and on conditions unacceptable to the other side.

The USA, having taken the course to return to the cold war, without batting an eye, renounced the solemnly adopted commitments to ratify the SALT II and move on to SALT III, pleading the events in the Near and Middle East which it itself provoked. Quite a graphic example of a breach of accords between states, a convincing confirmation of Leonid Brezhnev's pronouncements about the United States as an unreliable partner! The West European allies of the USA had a serious object-lesson.

It is time they drew due conclusions from that: NATO's double-track version is defunct--with only one track remaining and leading to an intensification of the arms race, and in the obtaining situation, through the will of the USA, still farther--directly to resumption of the cold war, to a dangerous increase in the level of military opposition.

In this connection one can say that in this new situation the European countries of NATO are objectively free of any obligations with regard to the USA, arising from the Brussels decisions.

The White House's vague 'promise' to return to the question of ratification of the SALT II treaty after the Presidential elections does not change the state of things--suffice it to say that the MX mobile missiles, the deployment of which is already to be started by that time, will upset the thoroughly adjusted balance of the treaty signed in Vienna.

At the same time the Soviet Union is ready to again return to direct talks between all the sides concerned on medium-range means provided NATO's Brussels decision is reversed or if only suspended. This way leading to progress of military detente in the obtaining situation will protect the destinies to detente in general from encroachments upon it on the part of the militarist circles of the USA. It remains to be hoped that West European countries take this way while there is still time--before Uncle Sam lures them to another--fatal road leading, whether they want it or not, to participation in U.S. dangerous military ventures in various regions of the world.

PRAVDA REVIEW ON NEW CARTER 'DOCTRINE OF AGGRESSION'

LD211437 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jan 80 p 4 LD

[Arkadiy Maslennikov "International Review"]

[Text] A Consistent Course

The strength of Soviet foreign policy consists in the fact that it is based on profound scientific analysis of the entire complex of international relations and consistently upholds the interests of the peoples seeking peace, freedom, independence and social progress. This is why even at turning-points in the international situation and in conditions of rapid and dramatic changes the foreign policy course of the CPSU and the Soviet state invariably meets with the understanding and support of peace-loving, progressive forces and all honest people in the world.

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev's replies to the PRAVDA correspondent have had an immense impact throughout the world. The flood of reactions shows that despite the mountain of lies piled up by propaganda organs in the West and in Beijing, particularly in connection with the situation in Afghanistan, broad circles of the world public are gaining a better and better grasp of the essence of the events that are taking place and can see where the real--American--threat and not the ficticious threat to peace comes from.

Foreign mass information media note that Soviet policy is counterposing to the emotional derangement [neurovnoveshennost] characteristic of many of the Washington administration's recent actions firmness, consistency and principledness in the approach to the solution of major and minor international problems. The whole world can now compare the U.S. administration's irresponsible, hysterical steps and its rash neglect of values that concern the whole of mankind with Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's principled, wise and sagacious statement, Czechoslovakia's RUDE PRAVO writes. The Soviet leader spoke from a position of peace and responsibility for the destiny of mankind which Western politicians lack. His statements leave no doubt that all attempts to hold talks with the USSR from a "position of strength" or diktat are doomed to failure, Poland's TRYBUNA LUDU states.

The Soviet Union's timely assistance insured the territorial integrity and guaranteed the independence and sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, says a statement signed by G. Hall, secretary general of the Communist Party of the United States, and H. Winston, its national chairman. It dealt a crushing blow to U.S. imperialism's sinister effort to undermine the revolutionary process started by the April revolution and to the attempts to turn this country into yet another bridgehead for military preparations. In turning to the USSR for assistance Afghanistan was exercising its inalienable right to sovereignty, the French communists' organ L'HUMANITE writes.

"Moscow's calmness and confidence" in connection with the American administration's attempts to influence the Soviet power's policy and subject our country to a trial of strength has made a great impression on broad circles of the international public. Noting that the measures to restrict deliveries of American goods, including grain, will have no more than a "symbolic" effect on the Soviet economy, many Western newspapers reprinted Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's words that the Soviet people possess sufficient potential for tranquil life and labor, for fulfilling their projected plans and for improving their well-being.

The Soviet peoples reacted with a feeling of satisfaction and hope to the Soviet Union's reaffirmed resolve to deliver a rebuff to the opponents of detente and to consolidate and multiply all the positive things that have been created through the years by the collective efforts of states, particularly on the European Continent.

The Soviet Union is unshakably pursuing a Leninist foreign policy course. This course, combining consistent love of peace with a firm rebuff to aggression, is a signpost to a reliable path toward safeguarding international security, freedom and independence of the peoples.

Under Critical Fire

It can now be stated with confidence that Washington's attempts, on the basis of an anti-Soviet slander campaign of unprecedented magnitude and notorious "sanctions," to distract the peoples' attention from the American threat to peace and the U.S. course toward undermining detente, cranking up the arms race and preparing aggressive adventures are failing and are beginning to rebound on their initiators. American newspaper "veteran" James Reston, who knows instinctively which way the wind is blowing, is already warning in the New York TIMES: "Nobody should ge deceived by short-term proclamations of allied support for punitive actions against Iran and the Soviet Union. They may help Carter politically at the primaries but in the longer term the allies clearly intend to pursue their own economic interests."

Moreover, as the WALL STREET JOURNAL notes, "The President is encountering opposition in the United States as well. His rivals, presidential nomination contenders from both the Democratic and the Republican parties, are openly criticizing his foreign policy as a whole, reckoning that it has failed."

Washington has learned fairly quickly that it is not so easy to topple the edifice of detente. This is particularly so in Europe, where the relaxation of tension has put down the deepest roots in recent years and afforded appreciable economic and political advantages. The U.S. administration's attempts to gain international support for its tyrannical anti-Soviet actions are not greeted enthusiastically in other parts of the world either. Brazil and Argentina have openly opposed the embargo on the delivery of grain and other agricultural products to the USSR. Japan has adopted a cautious stance on questions of economic sanctions.

In an attempt to stifle the growing criticism of its tyrannical actions and make the allies dance to Washington's tune the U.S. administration is resorting to pressure and real "arm-twisting." It was to this end that an EEC Council session and NATO Council session were held in Brussels recently on the insistence of the United States. But here too Washington was out of luck. It failed to gain approval of its policy. The representatives of France, the FRG, Italy, Turkey, Denmark and Greece participating in the NATO session refused to support "sanctions" against the USSR in the economic and cultural spheres.

It is important to note that many Western states are refusing to act according to Washington's instructions and not only out of economic considerations. Equally significant is sober-minded Western politicians' belief in the need to preserve and strengthen those elements of mutual understanding and cooperation among states with different social systems which have become part of the fabric of international relations during the years of detente.

Prominent statesmen and politicians in France, the FRG and other West European states are also coming out in favor of continuing this policy, which is in keeping with the peoples' fundamental interests and the cause of peace. Speaking in the Bundestag, FRG Chancellor H. Schmidt, in particular, stated: "It is necessary to maintain the dialog with one another, including the Soviet Union." He advocated "preserving what has been achieved," that is, the observance and full implementation of the FRG's treaties with the USSR, Poland, the CSSR and the GDR and the Quadripartite Agreement on West Berlin and also the preservation of "what the West and the East have achieved in the spirit of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe since 1975."

With each passing day the West European public is expressing increasing indignation in connection with the White House decision to postpone the ratification of the SALT II treaty. Everyone can see how this has inspired the U.S. military-industrial complex and its advocates, who are already launching trial balloons, openly discussing the question of steps prohibited by the provisions of the SALT II treaty. The Carter administration has essentially violated its "guarantee commitments" to the West European allies to insure the speediest ratification of this document. It is moving in the direction of undermining all the efforts in the sphere of military detente in whose progress all Europeans are vitally interested.

There is no doubt that the aggressive line will win the current American administration no laurels. By undertaking actions which run counter to the generally accepted practice of international relations as well as bilateral accords and trying to impose this line on others the Carter administration is merely adding to the picture of the United States as a totally unreliable partner, a state whose administration is guided by whim, caprice and emotional outburst and not by objective realities and concern for the orderly development of international relations. It is obvious that actions of this kind are fraught with inevitable errors. Sooner or later they will rebound on those who have undertaken them.

Having a premonition of this and fearing moral and political isolation, Washington is placing increasing emphasis on the further development of the propaganda campaign or rather psychological war against the USSR. The United States has even turned the United Nations into an arena for this war--the United Nations which, in defiance of the will of the legitimate Government of Afghanistan, was tyrannized into discussing the so-called "Afghan question." U.S. special services are daily slipping into the Western press one malicious fabrication after another about the USSR's "perfidious intentions," Soviet "threats" to one state or another and so forth. Participating in this unseemly ballyhoo on both sides of the Atlantic are not only professional anti-Soviets but also certain statesmen and parliamentarians whom you might expect to display a sense of elementary responsibility in keeping with their positions.

Mention must be made in this connection of the truly filthy and provocative venture of "respectable" British parliamentarians--Tories--who are currently collecting signatures for a "resolution" demanding that the Soviet Union be "warned" against any "interference" in Yugoslavia. What utter cynicism--to organize malicious provocations of this kind at a time when the head of the Yugoslav state is sick. How indelicate, primarily with regard to Yugoslavia itself!

A Doctrine of Aggression

Meanwhile, under cover of the anti-Soviet and anti-Afghan slander campaign Washington is continuing to rapidly build up U.S. naval and assault forces in the region of the Indian Ocean and Arabian Sea. Pentagon envoys are touring the countries of the Persian Gulf and East Africa looking for new bases and strong points for the deployment of "quick reaction corps" subunits and units in these strategically important areas. [paragraph continues]

The flood of weapons and ammunition into Afghan rebel camps in Pakistan is growing and more and more groups of instructors are being sent there. The real threat, not the imaginary one, to the security and territorial integrity of all the states in this region is growing.

Recently Washington has been trying to bring all these actions together within the organizational and political framework of a unified concept which the American press has already christened the "Carter Doctrine." This doctrine is based on the arms race, whose growing parameters were set out by Carter in his well-known speech to employers in mid-December. The constituent elements of the "doctrine" were set out the other day in a New York TIMES interview with U.S. Secretary of State C. Vance. They boil down to Washington's intention to intensify ever further the American military presence in the Indian Ocean region, to expand military assistance to U.S. allies and try to achieve regional agreements under its auspices like the Camp David deal between Egypt and Israel. All this, as Vance noted, should create "a sounder framework for regional cooperation," in other words, a military alliance between the United States and the states in the area.

Removing the parentheses from around certain elements of this plan, the American press notes that at the initial stage of its practical implementation Pakistan has a special role to play as the main bridgehead for subversive activity against the Afghan revolution. Obviously very much in a hurry to turn Pakistan into a direct policy instrument the Carter administration announced that Islamabad would get immediate military and economic aid worth $400 million. This was done not only without the Pakistani Government's having requested it but also without any preliminary consultations.

Questions of expanding military "assistance" to Pakistan were discussed at the recent NATO Council session in Brussels and during U.S. Secretary of Defense H. Brown's visit to China. The New York TIMES reports that at the talks with Brown "the Beijing leaders expressed their readiness to increase secret supplies of Chinese firearms to insurgents in Afghanistan." It is clearly for the purpose of implementing this plan that Chinese Foreign Minister Huang Hua is now in Pakistan. If not, why should his program include a visit to Peshawar, the location of the bases for training armed formations for dispatch to Afghanistan?

India has expressed its concern in connection with the expansion of weapons deliveries to Pakistan.

Behind the current ballyhoo about the nonexistent "threat to Pakistan" one is beginning to discern more and more not only a plan to transform this country into the instrument of interests alien to the Pakistani people but also the contours of a dangerous imperialist strategy for bringing some Asian countries into conflict with others and reviving military blocs and alliances aimed against the forces of national freedom and social progress. This is the essence of the U.S. "doctrine"--the doctrine of suppressing the national liberation struggle and blackmail and diktat against countries upholding their independence and freedom.

In the present-day international situation, where the correlation of forces in the world, despite imperialism's intrigues, is steadily changing in favor of the forces of peace, national independence and socialism, their enemies' intrigues can and must be thwarted. The detente policy has deep roots. It is supported by powerful forces and this policy has every chance of remaining the leading trend in relations among states.

CHRISTOPHER TRIP, EUROPEAN REACTION, IRANIAN SITUATION VIEWED

LD192340 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 19 Jan 80 LD

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Yevgeniy Petko]

[Text] Christopher, deputy U.S. secretary of state, has ended his trip to Western Europe. He visited Britain, the FRG, Belgium and France and other countries in this region in an attempt to intensify the pressure on Washington's partners from which the United States is demanding support for the economic and financial sanctions against Iran and the curtailment of business and cultural cooperation with the Soviet Union, speculating on the events in Afghanistan. The American envoy conducted talks with statesmen of the West European countries and represented the United States at a session of the NATO Council in Brussels, where a session of the EEC Council of Ministers was taking place. The EEC Council of Ministers also discussed the matter of the notorious economic sanctions against the Soviet Union. Now over to our correspondent in France, Vladimir Dmitriyev:

[Dmitriyev] I have in front of me the joint statement adopted by the foreign ministers of the Nine in Brussels. The document sets out the well-known stance of the EEC countries on the matter of events in Afghanistan and there is not the slightest hint in the document about support for Washington's decision on freezing cooperation with the Soviet Union. The interests of maintaining what has already been achieved along the path of developing detente and trade-economic ties in Europe between countries with different social systems have apparently turned out to be higher than the short-term interests of the Washington administration, which has embarked on a dangerous course aimed at aggravating international tension. And although the joint statement distorts the real reasons why the situation in the Middle East has become complicated and although the aims of the Soviet Union in granting fraternal aid to Afghanistan are interpreted arbitrarily, in essence, just as in Washington, nevertheless the ministers of the Nine Common Market countries who adopted this document do not think it necessary to follow the instructions of the American authorities. The statement expresses confidence that the development of the process of detente corresponds to the interests of all peoples.

Attempts by the United States, by way of its representative, Christopher, to enlist the support of the West European countries at the NATO Council session were not crowned with success, either.

[Petko] As Comrade Brezhnev noted in his replies to the questions of the PRAVDA correspondent, the total sum of the steps by the American administration in connection with the events in Afghanistan--the freezing of the SALT II treaty, the refusal to supply a whole series of goods, including grain, to the USSR, the stopping of talks with the Soviet Union on a number of matters of bilateral relations and so on--testifies to the fact that Washington is again, just as decades ago, trying to speak to us in the language of cold war. By doing so the Carter administration is demonstrating a lack of respect for important interstate documents and is violating ties that have become established in the sphere of science, culture and human contact. What is the view of French political circles in this respect?

[Dmitriyev] Those in Paris think that France must not exploit its business relations for political ends. This was confirmed by Foreign Affairs Minister Francois-Poncet, who stated in a Senate commission that France will not come forward with initiatives capable of resuming the cold war. Let me recall, by the way, that the American authorities put an embargo last year on the supply of computer equipment to the USSR and tried to influence their partners in West Europe so that the latter would refrain from cooperation in this sphere with the Soviet Union.

The pressure was to no avail. A French firm supplied electronic equipment to the USSR and American companies, as a result of the discriminatory decision of the authorities, suffered losses. One must expect similar results, as is being stressed here in business circles, also in connection with the refusal by the United States to export grain and other agricultural produce to the USSR.

[Petko] And what is the view of French business circles?

[Dmitriyev] The paper LES ECHOS, organ of the industrialists, has said on more than one occasion that the freezing by America of business ties with the USSR cannot influence Moscow's policies. (Jean Domingue), president of a large agricultural cooperative association, in an interview with LE MONDE called Carter's decision on suspending grain exports to the USSR absurd.

[Petko] Thus, are we dealing with political or trade-economic matters? The countries of Western Europe, guided by their national interests, the interests of developing international cooperation on the principles of independence and detente, reject the policy of blackmail and diktat by Washington. And now we will ask a correspondent to report from another West European country which Washington's envoy Chirstopher visited this week. As soon as it came to power the Conservative government of Great Britain took upon itself the role of active supporter of the foreign policy course of the American administration--a course hostile to the matter of detente and leading to an intensification of military danger and to an inflation of the arms race. The ruling circles of Great Britain blindly following the lead of Washington's foreign policy, zealously supported the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe and were the first among the West European countries to adopt a decision on deploying these missiles on their own territory. Then, the events in Iran: Again the adventurist plans of the Carter administration are receiving full support, above all in the shape of the British Conservatives. What is the position of the ruling circles of Great Britain today toward the latest actions of the United States? Our correspondent in London, Yuriy Kobaladze, reports:

[Kobaladze] Even to a greater extent than before Great Britain, as it so happens, can be included in those countries which, as Leonid Ilich Brezhnev neatly put it in his replies to questions put by a PRAVDA correspondent, are piling up heaps of lies to whip up an impudent anti-Soviet campaign around the events in Afghanistan. In London American politicians are finding more understanding than in any other European capital. It is no coincidence that Britain was the first country among the other European states to be recently visited by U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Christopher. The aims of Washington's envoy included plans to discuss possible actions by the West in the light of the events in Afghanistan. Commenting on the results of Christopher's visit to Europe, local observers have been noting that it is only in the British capital that the policy of the United States has met with unqualified support.

[Petko] While the American envoy was traveling around Europe, Lord Carrington, foreign secretary of Great Britain, left on a more distant trip. His itinerary included countries of the Near East and South Asia. The British minister conducted talks in the capitals of Turkey, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and India. What ends did the trip by the British minister pursue and what were its results?

[Kobaladze] Carrington's trip was embarked on immediately after the American Government announced measures designed to strengthen the United States' military presence in this part of the world. It was precisely matters of a military nature, as the London press notes, that invariably figured during the talks that Carrington had. The British minister has returned to London.

The press notes that he did not manage to enlist united support for the plans of the United States and Great Britain in this region. At any rate, they made it plain to the British minister that there was no use on counting on the creation of military bases in the five countries. The failure of Carrington's diplomatic mission has not discouraged the British Government. Even during his visit a decision was made to send to the Mediterranean area five British naval ships. These ships will join up with vessels of the American fleet deployed in the Mediterranean. All these facts testify to the fact that Britain is now the only country in Europe giving unreserved support to the policy of the United States of charging up military psychosis.

[Petko] The events in Iran, and also around the situation in this country, continue to draw the fixed attention of the world public. We have telephoned through to our correspondent for the countries of the Near and Middle East, Leonid Rassadin, who recently visited Iran. What is the situation there like, a year after the victory of the revolution that put an end to oppression and the monarchist regime that was closely linked with American imperialism?

[Rassadin] It is not possible to give an unambiguous answer to your question for the processes taking place in Iran are very complex and intricate. At present the country is on the threshold of the first presidential elections and there are more than enough candidates for this post. It is true that in Tehran not so many persons are being named as serious contenders--mainly those who are members of the Revolutionary Council or eminent figures who fully support the Islamic republic regime. Reports have also appeared in literally the past few days that the presidential elections will possibly be put off. But in any case this is not the crux of the matter. Within the country the thing being talked about is the extremely tense situation which has been brought about by the increasingly strengthening intrigues of the reaction, including of pro-monarchic elements which have not been finished off from the former SAVAK secret police. The latter is being supplied by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. It is precisely the American agency which is provoking clashes in various regions of Iran, is carrying out terrorist operations and is kindling various kinds of discord on a national and religious basis.

[Petko] And apart from this, the United States is exerting strong pressure on Iran from outside, isn't it?

[Rassadin] Perhaps the main task of imperialism at this stage is to attempt in the beginning to, so to speak, soften up the Iranian revolution from within, and if this is unsuccessful to undermine it by crude force. This week the flagship of the U.S. 6th Mediterranean Fleet--the atomic aircraft carrier Nimitz--left for the Indian Ocean. The Nimitz, accompanied by cruisers, will soon join other American ships in the Persian Gulf area. In other words, the Pentagon is rattling the saber and is obviously threatening Iran with a military blockade. Attempts by the American administration to spout on about an alleged Soviet threat to Iran look really hypocritical against this background. The Iranians know full well who in fact is charging up tension in the Near and Middle East, and who in reality is threatening the sovereignty of the young republic.

I had an opportunity to visit one of the biggest Iranian naval bases, in Bandar 'Abbas, and to chat there with many officers of the fleet. They all said that Iran does not want war. However, if aggression is carried out against Iran by the United States then the Iranian people and their armed forces will give a worthy rebuff to the enemy.

[Petko] Can tension be felt in the Iranian capital itself?

[Rassadin] On the whole Tehran is living normally. The majority of enterprises, institutions and schools are functioning and shops are open. Nevertheless, the country's main city is reacting in a stormy fashion to the events taking place. Crowds of people gather near Tehran University until the late evening--they argue and discuss. And usually on Fridays--this is the day off in the country--thousands of people take part in street demonstrations. Irrespective of their political convictions the Iranians are united by a common platform of sharp condemnation of the present conspiracy of the United States against Iran and its revolution. The Iranian people state as loud as they can that they are determined to oppose this imperialist conspiracy and to maintain the independence and territorial integrity of the country.

[Petko] With this we end our broadcast. It was prepared by the international section of the all-union radio. It was conducted by Yevgeniy Petko. Good-bye, comrades. All the best to you.

UN ISSUES LETTER TO CARTER FROM TARAKI'S WIDOW

LD220704 Moscow TASS in English 0613 GMT 22 Jan 80 LD

[Text] New York, January 22, TASS--The letter from the widow of the First Chairman of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Nur Mohammad Taraki has been issued at the U.N. headquarters as an official document of the Security Council at the request of Afghanistan's permanent representation.

The letter addressed to U.S. President J. Carter expresses indignation at Washington's attempts to take under its protection Amin and his assistants, who killed the legitimate head of the state of Afghanistan.

EMBASSY BUGGING SEEN AIMED AT 'BLACKMAIL' OF SOVIET CITIZENS

LD221129 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 5 LD

[Article by B. Antonov: "Caught Red-Handed Again"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Bugging devices secretly installed by the U.S. secret service have been discovered in the living quarters of the Soviet Embassy in Washington. The Soviet Embassy in the United States has lodged a resolute protest at these subversive acts by the U.S. secret services against Soviet establishments in the United States.

A residential block of the Soviet Embassy in Washington was handed over by a U.S. construction company late last year. On taking delivery of the first building phase a USSR Foreign Ministry state committee discovered substantial faults. The committee stated that in places the wall facings were hanging on by a thread and that cracks had been found in walls and pillars. The consulting engineer of the (Carl S. Hanson) construction firm admitted the faults.

He investigated the faults and wrote in his report. "I saw cracks mainly in the corners of the buildings, rows of bricks protruding on every floor and cracks in facing crosspieces.... On examination we discovered that many of the bricks and wallboards had been thinned down, although the distance between the concrete and the exposed side of the facing corresponded to the plans...."

But the most sensational thing the construction experts found were the residential block's amazing acoustics. Every sound--from a word spoken in a living room to a whisper in a bedroom or a splash of water in a toilet--could be heard clearly in the offices of such departments as the FBI and the CIA.

The quirks of the acoustics were solved when microphones batteries, transmitters, cables and wiring intended for bugging purposes were discovered in hollow structures and bricks.

This is not the first time that the U.S. secret services have been caught red-handed. At various times dozens of secret microphones and other bugging devices have been discovered and removed from the premises of Soviet missions and residences on U.S. territory. The first exhibits were discovered on a suburban embassy compound near Washington, where members of the Soviet Embassy staff vacation and which used to be the site of the Soviet Embassy's Pioneer camp. Some children happened to pull out of a wall a flex to which bugging microphones were attached.

On their arrival Soviet experts discovered on the central cable of the automatic telephone exchange serving the Soviet Embassy's suburban compound a special junction box from which ran a flex with wires leading to respective U.S. establishments. It transpired that the wiring had been done in December 1976, when the Americans were installing the telephone line for the buildings in the compound, and was intended for spying purposes.

Bugging devices were also discovered shortly afterward in the USSR trade legation building. It should be pointed out here that this establishment's previous premises had also been packed with bugging devices. Alas, the new building on Connecticut Avenue, bought in January 1965, proved no better than the old one. On the first floor a highly sophisticated radioelectronic bugging device complete with batteries was found in a fireplace by the entrance to the lobby. [paragraph continues]

An identical device was found in a fireplace on the second floor. Bugging devices were planted in the chimney. On the other floors special bugging systems were located inside hollow bricks in the wall and behind baseboards.

An impressive bugging system was removed from the six-story USSR Consulate General building in San Francisco. Wiring from bugging devices ran like a spider's web through every floor in the building. The bugging system's central cable ran right under the foundations into an adjacent building rented by the secret service.

In addition to fixed electronic espionage systems, in recent years a large number of bugging devices installed by the FBI and the CIA have been discovered in automobiles belonging to members of the USSR's UN delegation and Soviet members of the UN Secretariat in New York. As a rule, microphones are fitted under the car upholstery behind the driver's and passenger seats.

How do U.S. "independent businessmen" who conclude building contracts with Soviet missions come to be mixed up in the espionage business? We are certain that the initiative does not come from the business world. The bugging devices are put in the walls by the secret services and, what is more, with the approval of very high U.S. authorities.

Just which authorities is clear from President Carter's "U.S. Intelligence Work" directive of 24 January 1978. Paragraph 1-303, headed "Secret Operations To Obtain Intelligence Information", states that in accordance with the procedure laid down by the President all proposals for such operations are to be submitted to Zbigniew Brzezinski, assistant to the President for national security affairs. This is done at meetings of the U.S. National Security Council's special coordinating committee. These meetings are attended by the secretary of state, the defense secretary, the attorney general and other senior officials. Under Paragraph 1-302 the coordinating committee examines and submits for Presidential approval recommendations on all types of operations of this kind carried out by U.S. intelligence.

Why was it necessary to bug Soviet establishments and residential quarters in the United States? After all, the U.S. authorities are well aware that the Soviet Embassy, the Consulate and the Trade Legation all have the job of promoting the establishment of businesslike and mutually advantageous relations between the two countries and the expansion of contacts between their citizens. The spying on Soviet establishments, including the bugging of a children's camp and of residential apartments, which is widely practiced in the United States is not accidental. Numerous facts show that the U.S. secret services need to do it in order to gather a variety of information, especially on Soviet citizens' private lives, which, against the background of the U.S. administration's demagogic pronouncements about the defense of human rights, they actively utilize to blackmail Soviet citizens and organize various other dirty provocations against them.

COMMENT ON CARTER'S CALL FOR MOSCOW OLYMPICS BOYCOTT

Demand Clearly Political

LD211618 Moscow TASS in English 1556 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

["Subversive Operation by Washington or Scoring a Goal in One's Own Net"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, January 21, TASS--TASS political news analyst Vladimir Goncharov writes:

Speaking in a televised program "Meet the Press" President J. Carter demanded that the U.S. Olympic Committee should not send a U.S. team to Moscow and that the Olympic games be transferred from the Soviet capital to some other venue or be annulled altogether.

President Carter "justified" all these demands by references to "the developments in Afghanistan", grossly distorting their essence.

Carter's demands have caused, judging by the evidence available, a different reaction from the one the U.S. President counted on. According to Washington POST, for instance, in many countries of the world including the United States of America itself these demands caused frustration and protests both among sportsmen and sports organizations. President of the International Olympic Committee Lord Killanin said that implementation of Carter's demands about the nonparticipation of U.S. athletes in the Olympic games in Moscow would be tantamount to a catastrophe, with the Olympic movement as a whole and all the sportsmen of the world being the losers.

Lord Killanin also said that the Article 24 of the Olympic Charter provides that national Olympic committees counteract any forms of pressure to which they are subjected--economic, religious and political. In this connection, the newspaper New York DAILY NEWS has every reason to state that Carter just has not got any right to order a boycott by the United States of the Olympic games in Moscow.

The fact is, however, that President Carter (who is known to boast being a human rights champion) has no use for the rights of others if these run counter to his political ambitions. As a matter of fact, athletes and the sports movement are assigned, in his present adventure, the role of some kind of hostages (again despite the fact that of late Carter has repeatedly denounced the use of hostages for the attainment of political ends.)

If rights, rules of laws stand in Carter's way he steps over them by the use of force. The newspaper Washington POST says today that the White House officials made it clear that the U.S. administration is ready to make the U.S. Olympic Committee and the U.S. athletes knuckle under, if they insist on going to Moscow. London's FINANCIAL TIMES stresses in this connection that most sportsmen would prefer to take part in the sports competitions in Moscow.

If one is to speak about Carter's adventure as a whole it will become evident that the President's demand is clearly political and its aim is to disrupt detente and to undermine peaceful cooperation of the peoples.

It has been repeatedly pointed out that many decisions taken by Carter of late have in effect had the nature of electoral campaign moves (it is characteristic that Carter made public his demand to boycott the Moscow Olympic games literally on the eve of the election of delegates to national conventions of the Democratic and the Republican parties in the state of Iowa) with Carter trying to meet the interests above all of those militarist and reactionary forces which back in the past were considered by Goldwater as his political base.

The call to boycott the Olympic games accords with the demands of those cirlces which have already long ago, several years ago to be more precise, opposed the holding of the 1980 Olympic games in a socialist country. Carter's present decision which clearly has the nature of an electoral cmapign move is designed to gain the support of the powers that be in the United States, those "money bags" who finance the Presidential campaign candidates.

Olympic sports games are known to have a long history. Carter appears to be willing to leave his mark in the Olympic history in the style of Herostratos, i.e. as a man who attempted to disrupt this international sports and youth holiday. If one is to use sports terminology, one can say that the Olympic annals will recall Carter as a man who erected, rather than cleared, hurdles and that Carter's decision will, in the long run, doubtless prove a goal he scored into his own net.

Zagladin: 'Premeditated Act'

NC211315 Paris AFP in English 1314 GMT 21 Jan 80 NC

[Text] Paris, Jan 21, (AFP)--President Jimmy Carter's call for the Olympic games to be switched from Moscow if Soviet troops are not out of Afghanistan in one month's time was "a worry to the whole world," leading Soviet official, Mr Vadim Zagladin said on French television today.

In what was the first official Soviet reaction to the Carter initiative, Mr Zagladin, who is [first] deputy-chief of the International Department of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee, spoke direct from Moscow to interviewers in Paris.

Mr Zagladin said that President Carter's call to boycott the Olympics was "contradictory to the Olympic statute" and went against the opinion of International Olympic Committee president, Lord Killanin.

He went on to say that President Carter had used the Afghanistan situation as a "pretext to do what he wanted to do before" and that it had been a "premeditated act".

Asked whether the Olympic games would go on as scheduled were the Americans to pull out, Mr Zagladin said that all the invitations had been sent out and the Organising Committee were now awaiting the replies.

As regards Soviet participation at next month's Lake Placid Winter Olympics, Mr Zagladin said "it is not us (the Soviet Union) who are making problems for the Olympics."

Asked whether Soviet troops would be out of Afghanistan by February 20--when President Carter's ultimatum runs out--he added that they (Soviet troops) would [remain] in Afghanistan "as long as was necessary."

Mr Zagladin said it was not just the future of the Moscow Olympic games which were at stake, but the future of the Olympics as a whole.

Shortly before this, in a French radio interview, IOC Secretary Monique Berlioux said that President Carter's statement "was not realistic" and that it was not possible to transfer or adjourn the games.

She added that the absence of American athletes at Moscow would be "deplorable", and that such an outcome would force the IOC "to reconsider the holding of the 1984 Olympics at Los Angeles."

Mrs Berlioux, emphasized, however, that President Carter "had not spoken of a boycott, but had asked the United States Olympic Committee to support his recommendation not to send athletes to Mosoow."

"That's an important nuance," she said.

[Moscow in Serbo-Croatian to Yugoslavian 2030 GMT on 21 January reports Zagladin's interview with French television and his comments on the Olympic games and Afghanistan as follows:

[Touching on the U.S. President's attempt to organize a boycott of the Olympic games in Moscow, Vadim Zagladin said this action could not but surprise everyone, for it is in contradiction to the word of the Olympic Charter. Sport and politics are different things. The U.S. actions affect the fate of the Olympic games as a whole, and not only the Mosocw Olympics.

[They bring into question the good will of sportsmen throughout the world. I must say, Vadim Zagladin stated, that Mr Carter's action is not an answer to the reality of the modern world. This is a premeditated step, (for) there had already been discussion of withdrawing from the Olympic games long before the events in Afghanistan.

[The present action, accordingly, is linked with the United States other plans. Involved here is the wave of international tension which the United States began to raise in 1974, and also the new wave of military preparations in the United States, which was last year exported to Europe.

[Concerning the change of leadership in Afghanistan, Vadim Zagladin said that this is the affair of the Afghans themselves. Babrak Karmal, the present head of government of Afghanistan, has explained this to foreign journalists, including French journalists. After Amin killed Taraki, a strong opposition arose in Afghanistan comprising the Revolutionary Council, the Central Committee of the party, members of the army and the intelligentsia. Babrak Karmal then returned to Afghanistan, and together with Amin's opponents prepared the coming to power of the new leadership.

[Here Vadim Zagladin cited facts that there are as yet no signs of the United States and China ceasing their interference in the affairs of Afghanistan. Vadim Zagladin said that the Soviet contingents would be withdrawn from Afghanistan as soon as foreign interference in the affairs of that country ceased.]

Athletes Opposition to Boycott Call

LD211510 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Igor Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] On Sunday, President Carter called on American athletes to boycott the 1980 Olympics in Moscow. The appeal has met with resistance in wide sports quarters. Our observer Igor Dmitriyev has this comment.

Lord Killanin, president of the International Olympic Committee, has told THE TIMES of London that there is universal condemnation of the attempts being made to use the games as a political football. (Julian) Roosevelt, an American delegate to the International Olympic Committee, has noted that President Carter had done a tremendous disservice to the athletes. U.S. Olympic Committee officials express the opinion that Mr Carter has put American athletes before an extremely difficult choice of either being a good American, from the administration's point of view, or an athlete.

To bring pressure to bear on American athletes, State Department officials are said to be considering refusing passports to those of them who want to go to Moscow. Another retaliatory move against the American Olympic Committee is said to be financial pressure on it. Mr Carter's call for a boycott is widely seen as a declaration of war on those Americans who believe that since the President has no legal power in Olympic matters he cannot impose his personal will on them. The anti-Olympic campaign by the administration and punitive steps against U.S. athletes, discussed at the State Department, may serve as an eye-opener to many Americans that their country is not as free from the establishment as they used to think. Colonel Donald Miller, the U.S. committee's executive director, has stated that he is opposed to a U.S. boycott. He said yesterday that his committee had a trust in representing American athletes in the international Olympic movement. Washington's call for a boycott has been defied not only in words. Thus American swimmers are said to be in favor of going to Moscow and a team of American wrestlers has already arrived in the Soviet Union for a tour. It is also believed that a team of American boxers will honor their previous commitment and come here for a series of bouts. Last September, Mr Carter went rubber-legged and dropped out of Maryland's (marathon) race. Even if he is not trying to score even with sports after this mishap, President Carter will hardly succeed in making the international Olympic movement go rubber-legged.

Other Opposition to Boycott

LD212335 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Washington, January 21, TASS--Schemes now being hatched by the Washington administration around the forthcoming summer Olympic games to be held in Moscow are being resolutely condemned in the sports circles of the United States. The latter express profound indignation over President J. Carter's and other officials' attempts to revive the campaign to boycott the Olympic games, which is known to have given up the ghost several times, stressing that the U.S. Government, in violation of the Olympic principles is turning sports into a means for political blackmail. U.S. representative in the International Olympic Committee J. Roosevelt has expressed her sharp disagreement with the actions of U.S. administration. She said she was very much concerned by the fact that U.S. political figures and the so-called leaders in Washington interfere in the Olympic movement. U.S. athletes are seriously concerned over the fact that because of the position taken by the United States the years of intensive training and millions of dollars spent on the training of the national team may just become money wasted. World record holder, U.S. sprinter H. Glance, said that if U.S. athletes are prevented from participating in the Olympic games this will be a most cruel disenchantment to them. Management of the NBC television company which signed a contract to cover the Moscow Olympics has stressed in a statement that regardless of the stand taken by the U.S. administration the company will insure the coverage of sports programs from Moscow. Attempts by the United States to prevent the holding of the Olympic games have failed to find in other countries of the world the support on which Washington had counted. According to newspaper New York TIMES, Egypt was the only country of all the U.S. allies which responded immediately to the call of President Carter.

London, January 21, TASS--President of the International Olympic Committee Lord Killanin has categorically rejected Washington's intrigues aimed at disrupting the Moscow Olympic games. In an interview to the newspaper TIMES of London he said that there can be no question of transferring the Olympic games into any other country. Lord Killanin said that on the basis of consultations with representatives of all the sports federations and national Olympic committees he could say that the attempts to use the Olympic games for political ends meet with universal condemnation. He said he did not know what President Carter was after but was positive that U.S. President ought to have consulted the U.S. Olympic Committee before making such a step.

D. Follows, president of the British Olympic Association, said that he supported the stand taken by Lord Killanin one hundred percent. We are of the view, D. Follows stressed, that sports and politics must be kept as much apart as possible.

Paris, January 21, TASS--President of the French National Olympic and Sports Committee C. Collar, is of the view that the campaign unleashed by the United States against the Moscow Olympic games is undermining the Olympic movement as a whole. President Carter's appeals, he stressed, will not make France change its position and France will be represented in Moscow.

Stockholm, January 21, TASS--Our government does not intend to interfere in the question about our country's participation in the Olympic games in Moscow, which must be within the purview of our sports organizations, said Swedish Prime Minister T. Falldin.

The Swedish Olympic Committee, said its President Karl Gustav Anderberg, considers the use of sports for political blackmail inadmissible. We, he stressed, shall take part in the Moscow Olympic games.

'CARTER DOCTRINE' OF 'AGGRESSION' PREDATES AFGHAN, IRANIAN EVENTS

LD211341 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 19 Jan 80 p 3 LD

[Observer Sergey Losev international review: "Behind the Facade of Aggressive Doctrines"]

[Text] Washington's official envoys are now scurrying round the capitals of the West European, Near East and Asian countries. Resorting to overt arm-twisting tactics and unconcealed blackmail and pressure, the U.S. administration is trying to force its NATO allies and Japan to join in hostile U.S. measures against the Soviet Union and Iran.

Meanwhile new doctrines of aggression and neocolonialism are hastily being elaborated in the White House "corridors of power." The U.S. press even cites the date and venue for the proclamation of the "Carter doctrine": 23 January at the joint session of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

U.S. imperialism is seeking to conceal all these unseemly actions and maneuvers with a hysterical anti-Soviet campaign. Speculating on recent events in Afghanistan, U.S. propaganda is trying to present matters as though the course the United States has taken toward renouncing the policy of detente is some sort of "reply" to the Soviet Union's granting of aid to Afghanistan--aid given in response to repeated requests from the Afghan Government with the sole aim of repelling outside aggression.

In reality, long before the present events in Afghanistan the United States had embarked on the path of intensifying the arms race, organizing armed intervention in the affairs of developing countries, and creating to this end a network of new military bases and the so-called "quick reaction corps" to maintain its rule over raw material sources.

The leaders of U.S. foreign policy, seeking to whitewash their actions, are now resorting to the outright falsification of facts. Thus, for instance, in an interview with the New York TIMES, U.S. Secretary of State C. Vance asserted that "the events in Afghanistan have undermined the basis" for continuing Soviet-U.S. talks on the limitation and subsequent reduction of military activity in the Indian Ocean. How do matters really stand? The talks on this problem were broken off unilaterally by the United States back in February 1978, and Washington gave a negative response to the USSR's repeated suggestions for their resumption. At the same time the Pentagon set about building up U.S. naval forces in the Indian Ocean: The United States moved on from occasional calls by a U.S. attack aircraft carrier group to permanent deployment of aircraft carrier forces there and is now openly speaking of creating a new fleet, the U.S. 5th fleet, in the Indian Ocean, Persian Gulf and Arabian Sea. Then the United States began to turn the base on Diego Garcia into the largest U.S. naval and air force outpost in this region and a stronghold for implementing U.S. interventionalist plans in the Near and Middle East.

Long before the present events in Afghanistan and Iran the United States had set about creating the so-called "quick reaction" forces--that instrument of military interference in the affairs of sovereign countries and peoples for the sake of safeguarding the interests of U.S. oil monopolies and safeguarding some U.S. "right" to continue to plunder the developing countries' natural resources. Back in April 1978 U.S. Defense Secretary H. Brown, speaking at Washington's Foreign Press Club, threatened: "A plan has been elaborated for armed intervention in the Persian Gulf in the event of a threatened halting of U.S. oil supplies from that region."

It was precisely then that Z. Brzezinski, the U.S. President's national security aide, advanced his odious theory of creating "an arc of crises" [as published] on the Soviet Union's southern borders and "an arc of instability" from South Africa to Southeast Asia where the U.S. "quick reaction corps" could operate.

"We can now operate more rapidly than we could 3 years ago and we will operate still more rapidly in 2 years' time and in 4 years' time," Brzezinski boasted recently in an interview with the WALL STREET JOURNAL, touching on the implementation of plans to create interventionist forces.

We are implementing a long-term program, he said. Thus, for instance, for the quick reaction forces we are building 14 ships which will be deployed in position in good time for the Marine Corps. We are improving the process of the prompt deployment of military equipment at overseas sites. Thus we now have equipment ready for five divisions; by 1982 enough will be available for six divisions, and by 1986 for nine divisions...

It should be perfectly clear to any sane person that the Afghan events in this case are absolutely irrelevant: It is a case of a carefully conceived long-term policy which the United States has long been implementing--a policy of blackmail, threats and interference which Washington is trying to pursue with respect to regimes in any way inconvenient to U.S. imperialism.

What the Carter administration is doing with respect to revolutionary Iran is a blatant manifestation of attempts to resurrect "gunboat diplomacy."

Taking advantage of the problem of the U.S. diplomats held hostage in Tehran, Western propaganda is now trying to arouse the whole world against the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Soviet position on the question of the hostages is well known. It is that the USSR invariably advocates observance of the Vienna convention on diplomatic immunity. However, the Soviet Union cannot allow the problem of the so-called hostages to be used as a pretext for an economic and naval blockade against revolutionary Iran. Iran's just demands against the United States are understandable not only to Soviet people but to many Americans. As Harvard University Prof R. Fisher notes in the 14 January 1980 issue of NEWSWEEK [as published], in "flagrant violation of international law, the United States organized a coup d'etat in Iran in 1953; it helped keep the despotic shah in power for 25 years; it trained secret police who tortured and murdered thousands of people; it helped the shah to take out of Iran billions of dollars rightfully belonging to the Iranian people and helped the shah to escape punishment, giving him the opportunity to live in luxury on tropical beaches. The United States is reluctant to accept the Iranian revolution, unwilling to apologize for its past crimes and unprepared to refrain from interfering in its internal affairs. To judge by what the CIA has done in Iran, Chile and other countries it is obvious that the United States is showing no genuine concern for the observance of international law and human rights. On the contrary, by inviting the shah to New York, turning the students' seizure of the embassy into an 'international crisis' and threatening to resort to military action, the United States has evidently laid the foundation for another overthrow of the Iranian Government...."

If official Washington were really concerned to secure the U.S. diplomats' release, it would of course not have left unanswered the conditions Iran advanced: It would agree to the creation of an international commission to investigate crimes committed by the shah during his rule and permit UN recognition of Iran's right to demand the shah's extradition and to possess the property and wealth of the shah's family.

However, instead of this the United States has concentrated a naval armada close to Iranian shores and, on the pretext of defending "its vital interests," is threatening Iran with a naval blockade and other measures.

U.S. politicians, who have grown accustomed to behaving high-handedly with other states and peoples, to behaving as though everything were permitted them, should remember that the correlation of forces in the international arena now is quite different from what it was in the days of John Foster Dulles. And no new White House doctrines will be able to change this obstinate reality.

As Comrade L.I. Brezhnev noted in his replies to the PRAVDA correspondent's questions, "we realize that U.S. imperialism's deliberate aggravation of the international situation expresses its dissatisfaction with the consolidation of socialism's positions, the rise of the national liberation movement and the strengthening of the forces supporting detente and peace. We know that the peoples' will has beaten a way through all obstacles to the positive direction in world affairs which is now expressed by the word 'detente.' This policy as deep roots. It is supported by powerful forces and has every chance of remaining the leading trend in relations between states."

ZHUKOV ARTICLE ON 'MORBID SANCTIONS SYNDROME'

LD211531 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jan 80 p 4 LD

[PRAVDA political observer Yuriy Zhukov article: "Intoxication in Washington"]

[Text] Reports from Washington in the last few days confirm more and more convincingly that the U.S. leaders are turning sharply away from the course of international relations which was elaborated by common consent and enshrined in a whole series of international and bilateral agreements in the first half of the seventies.

As Comrade L.I. Brezhnev noted in his answers to a PRAVDA correspondent's questions published on 13 January, "the sum total of the American administration's steps in connection with events in Afghanistan--the freezing of the SALT II treaty, the refusal to supply a whole series of goods, including grain, to the USSR in accordance with several contracts already concluded, the breaking off of talks with the Soviet Union on a series of questions of bilateral relations and so forth--indicates that Washington is again trying to start talking the language of 'cold war' with us, as it did decades ago. Here J. Carter's administration is displaying disrespect for important interstate documents and is breaking established ties in the sphere of science, culture and human contact."

Washington is now really in the grip of bellicose intoxication, and things are happening there which are causing surprise and concern even among the United States' closest allies. "J. Carter is behaving like a character in a science fiction melodrama," Britain's DAILY MAIL wrote on 15 January. "He has changed practically overnight into...a screaming hawk."

A day earlier the New York TIMES announced that the U.S. President is preparing to proclaim a new doctrine similar to the "Truman doctrine" and that he intends to place the emphasis on actions "such as were characteristic of...the strategic diplomacy of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles." In other words it is a question of a return to the policy of "brinkmanship" which was implemented by Dulles in the fifties and which, as is known, suffered a shameful failure--the United States was forced to renounce it.

In Washington there is now a torrent of countless speeches, interviews, press conferences and television appearances by the U.S. President and his closest advisers whose content and nature remind one forcibly of the ill-starred character in the immortal satirical work by Saltykov-Shchedrin, "The Story of a Certain City," who could only make two exclamations: "I will destroy!" and "I will not tolerate it!" Here a kind of morbid sanction syndrome, which has infected the Washington leaders, is making itself felt very acutely: Appeals to the United Nations, to NATO and to the closest friends of the United States to use sanctions to "punish" states which do not suit Uncle Sam are emanating from Washington with increasing frequency.

For decades the United States has been maintaining an economic blockade of Cuba. It is now preparing an economic blockade of Iran. Economic sanctions are being imposed on Kampuchea and Afghanistan. Finally these lovers of the slogans "I will destroy!" and "I will not tolerate it!" are organizing a ban on trade with the Soviet Union.

After President Carter formulated this plan in his 4 January speech his ministers started to delegate the plan to its executors, as it were. Secretary of Agriculture Bergland, who was only recently persuading Soviet representatives to buy as much American grain as possible, has rapidly begun to close all possible channels of trade in agricultural produce.

As if forgetting his duty to trade, Commerce Secretary Klutznick has begun a fierce struggle against trade with those whom the President wishes to "punish" for refusing to accept American diktat.

On 10 January Klutznick appeared before the members of the so-called Consultative Council of the department's Bureau of East-West Trade and--contradicting himself and getting confused, as the American newspapers write--set out a program of actions which amounts virtually to the complete cessation of Soviet-American trade. The ban extends to literally all goods, including nonalcoholic beverages--Pepsi Cola and Coca Cola! In their hurry they even included furs on the prohibited list of "strategic" goods, although it is well known that the Americans have never sold them to us, but on the contrary have bought them from us.

The same day the Carter administration officially announced that it is not only stopping issuing new licences for the export of "strategic and high technology" goods to the USSR, but also "freezing" the export of goods for whose sale American firms have already received licences and signed contracts. Here the firms are warned that all licences will be subjected to a tough review (?) and some will not be confirmed (!). It remains to be explained that the list of "high technology" goods which it is prohibited to sell to the Soviet Union includes...agricultural machines and even phosphates!

One American commentator stated here that U.S. firms are now only permitted to export "boots and neckties" to the USSR.

But one wonders: How can you deal at all with such an unreliable partner, who, in violation of all international rules, tears up contracts already signed with unusual ease, motivated to do so by some kind of whims, caprices or emotional outbursts? And what is this unreliable partner counting on, in fact? Surely he must be aware that such a decision will inevitably boomerang?

This was stated openly on 11 January by the influential American newspaper the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR: "President Carter's decision on a sharp reduction in trade with the Soviet Union will work out expensive for Americans in general and the federal budget in particular. The budget deficit will increase. Our foreign trade deficit will also increase...." This will be a heavy blow, the newspaper notes, for the American budget, which is already burdened by vast military expenditure and inflation. "We can only hope (?)," a "prominent White House spokesman" said, "that the deficit (this year) will still not exceed $40 billion."

Sober-minded American businessmen who understand the significance of trade with socialist countries are seriously alarmed. "It is quite possible that this will give us great pleasure in the United States," James (Bau), vice president of the big Control Data Corporation, said with bitter irony. "'Ha ha, we have really shown you', but it will hardly harm the Russians." Many other representatives of firms hit by Carter's ban express themselves in the same spirit. The farmers who were counting on major grain sale deals are also disturbed.

Fearing loss of votes at the Presidential elections next fall, Carter, adopting increasingly openly the position of a Presidential candidate rather than a President, hurriedly sent his agriculture secretary, Bergland, to Iowa, where the farmers have suffered most from the ban on grain sales to the Soviet Union. (As one of Iowa's biggest farmers, (Jerry Rirdon), stated, "in connection with the emergency measures caused by events in Afghanistan, farmers will lose 10-15 percent of their income."

Bergland, according to the New York TIMES for 14 January, said frankly that the subject of events in Afghanistan is of no interest to farmers--many of them did not even know there was such a country. "You can say 'Afghanistan' to any average citizen," the secretary observed, "and he will not even understand what you are talking about." That is why he cynically chose anti-Sovietism as his frontline theme. "In addressing various audiences," the New York TIMES writes, "the secretary of agriculture used a well-rehearsed text which he knew by heart of his speech, which he always began by looking frankly at his listeners and warning them: 'The Russians are now testing us(?'), you and me, as they have never done before." "During his speeches," the New York TIMES goes on to say, "it seemed as if somewhere quite near, literally next to the silos, in the cold winter air of Iowa's agricultural land, the 'cold war' was beginning." And the newspaper stresses that Bergland, who is traveling at the expense of the "Committee to Reelect Carter and Mondale," is implementing his propaganda mission--whose aim, as the reader can see, is to directly intimidate the farmers--in accordance with instructions received "from Mr Carter personally."

On 16 January the New York TIMES recalled that before the 1976 elections "Carter invariably promised farmers that he would never impose an embargo (ban) on grain exports as long as the country's security interests did not require it" and that "Bergland himself said that the use of food as a diplomatic weapon makes as much sense as cutting off your own nose to spite your face." In this connection the newspaper stated that now "Carter can probably say goodbye to the votes of the farmers," who can see how the Washington leaders' deeds diverge from their words.

All the same, the henchmen of the military-industrial complex who are now setting the tone in Washington are following their own path, which was begun as early as fall 1974, when the U.S. signature on the American-Soviet trade agreement was erased. After that a great deal was said, including by the present U.S. President, to the effect that trade must be developed all the same, that the United States will never permit itself, in particular, to use the grain trade for political purposes, and so on and so forth. A lot of water has flowed under the bridge since then, and now everyone can see what those words were worth.

Some people are pinning a hollow dream on the new bans--as if they will help exacerbate food difficulties brought about in the USSR by the bad harvest in 1979 and thereby "punish" the Soviet people. Vain hopes! If with all these attacks they "want to test our strength," as Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said, that means completely ignoring historical experience. Just the same dreams were entertained in Washington in 1946, when we were in an incomparably more difficult position and when we also had a bad harvest. If we did not flinch then, what is Washington counting on today? Those who associate far-reaching plans with their "sanctions" have made a cruel mistake. Their calculations on the "deterioration" in the food situation in the USSR which could allegedly take place, they dream, as a result of the U.S. refusal to sell us grain are built on an absurd conception of our economic potential. "The Soviet people," Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said, "have adequate potential to live and work peacefully, to fulfill their plans and to increase their prosperity. In particular I can assure you that plans for supplying Soviet people with grain and grain products will not be reduced by a single kilogram." But American interests will suffer seriously as a result of the flagrant unilateral disruption of trade. And when the present bellicose intoxication in Washington is slightly dispelled, Uncle Sam, who will have to calculate losses and seek thoroughly for means of overcoming the ever increasing foreign trade deficit, inflation and unemployment, will have an even worse headache. Well, he will receive yet another instructive lesson from history.

ANICHKIN CLAIMS AFGHAN EVENTS EXCUSE FOR SALT SANCTIONS

LD211615 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Jan 80 p 1 LD

[Oleg Anichkin international review: "People's Will for Detente"]

[Text] The world public, press, radio and television are now paying exceptional attention to the replies made by L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to the PRAVDA correspondent's questions. The leader of the Soviet state, it is being widely noted, makes a profoundly reasoned, considered and constructive assessment of the present international situation in the light of recent actions by President J. Carter's administration.

As the Czechoslovak newspaper RUDE PRAVO stressed, the words of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev--an outstanding statesman who has devoted his entire life to the struggle for man's basic right, the right to live in peace--contain the firm confidence and determination of Soviet communists and the entire Soviet people to continue the struggle to strengthen peace and the peoples' security. Those U.S. circles who, in pursuit of their own imperialist and hegemonist interests, undertook dangerous steps jeopardizing detente and aimed at the blatant deterioration of international relations were held up to shame, the newspaper points out. L. I. Brezhnev exposed the attempts of the opponents of peace and detente to play on the events in Afghanistan, around which mountains of lies and slander are being piled up and a shameless anti-Soviet campaign is being mounted. The events in Afghanistan are not the real reason for the present complication of the international atmosphere. If there had been no Afghanistan, certain circles in the U.S. and NATO would probably have found another pretext for aggravating the world situation.

The imperialist forces' hostile reaction to events in Afghanistan comes as no surprise. The crux of the matter is that the card on which the imperialists and their accomplices were gambling has been trumped here.

Washington's policy is being convincingly criticized on the other side of the Atlantic, in the United States, as well, in the opinion of the authoritative FOREIGN AFFAIRS magazine policy, "the inconsistency of President Carter's foreign policy--its clumsiness, its fragmented nature, its frequent changes in orientation, the wrong choice of the time to take decisions, the periodic loss of initiative--stems from one radical fact, from the very first there has been a flaw in the it: The government has never had a clear policy with regard to the USSR."

Many people are seriously alarmed by the President's decision to shelve the ratification on the Soviet-U.S. strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT II). The facts attest that this is not the first occasion the President has thought of renouncing the treaty. Initially the White House wanted to repay the treaty's opponents with its 5-year program for the unprecedented building up of U.S. military potential and then it used the Afghan events as a pretext for putting off the treaty's ratification indefinitely, in other words freezing it. The words now being uttered to the effect that the administration is not abandoning the SALT II agreement look rather unconvincing.

In any event this will hardly happen this year--the year of the Presidential elections. The United States has thus assumed a great resonsibility. This treaty is necessary not only to the Soviet Union but to no less an extent to the United States. It is perhaps the most important measure in the disarmament sphere since the war. It opens up prospects for further talks. Unless the SALT II treaty is ratified there will be no SALT III talks. Here it should be borne in mind that the shelving of the solution of this problem may lead to the accumulation of other problems. It is well known that disarmament talks, particularly talks on strategic arms limitation, lag behind the emergence of new arms systems. The continuing arms race may lead to a point where the opportunity of concluding monitorable agreements on its limitation disappears.

Many other countries, above all West European countries, are also interested in the SALT II treaty. It is no accident that the White House's decision regarding SALT II has given rise to an adverse reaction in a number of European countries. French Foreign Minister J. Francois-Poncet, for instance, stated on the Europe 1 Radio Station: The French Government has always considered it important to continue dialog with the Soviet Union. To preserve the process of detente, which is advantageous to all states, it is essential to ponder our decisions coolly and painstakingly. Frivolity can lead only to the negation of all the achievements of the policy of detente. The consequences of such a course are perfectly obvious. It is reported that Bonn, Tokyo and other capitals have also voiced serious doubts regarding Washington's decision on SALT II.

As for the President's other decisions on "sanctions" against the Soviet Union, there is no need to speak of them at length. Trade and economic relations, scientific and technical exchange and cultural ties are a mutually advantageous matter enriching both countries and peoples. There can be no question of counting on just one side suffering from violations of these relations. The Americans will also suffer. It is not for nothing that in his 4 January speech the President urged the Americans to "make sacrifices." For instance, the American farmer may suffer severely. The "grain embargo"--and Washington must be well aware of this--will boomerang on their vital interests and U.S. agriculture in general. Already, despite the reassurances of administration representatives, grain prices are falling. In Iowa, where out of every 10 inhabitants are employed in agriculture, hundreds of thousands of hushels of corn are lying under the snow. Already farmers are beginning to incur losses. Their faith has probably been shaken in J. Carter's promises to the Iowa farmers in 1976 that he would never resort to a grain embargo. As a result events are developing just as Alan (Grant), president of the American Federation of Farmers' Bureaus in Park Ridge (Illinois) said: "Mr Carter has aimed a double-barreled gun at the Russians, pulled the trigger and shot the American farmer."

Naturally the American farmers may also have growing fears that the Soviet Union may ultimately reject regular grain purchases: Inasmuch as the U.S. side is failing to observe the agreements on whose conclusion it once itself insisted. These actions by the U.S. administration will by no means cause Soviet people the harm on which their initiators are obviously counting. Cynical calculations as to the "deterioration" of the food situation in the Soviet Union as a result of the U.S. refusal to sell us grain are built on absurd notions of our economic potential. The Soviet people have sufficient potential to live and work in peace. This is not the first time that U.S. policy has acquired such a dangerous trend on the eve of Presidential elections. We came across this particularly frequently during the cold war, when the propagandization of hostility and even war against the Soviet Union was accepted as "good form" in the United States. Experience should have taught the United States a great deal. It should have taught it that talking with the Soviet Union in the language of force is a useless undertaking. As a result of the Carter administration's actions the world is forming an increasingly distinct impression of the United States as an absolutely unreliable partner in interstate relations, as a state whose leadership, prompted by some whims, caprices or emotional outbursts or by considerations of narrowly conceived immediate advantage, can at any moment violate its international commitments. Is there any need to explain what a dangerous destabilizing influence this is exerting on the entire international situation, all the more so when it is the leadership of a large, influential power from which the peoples have the right to expect a considered and responsible policy which is behaving in this way.

In his answers to the PRAVDA correspondent's questions L.I. Brezhnev stressed: "Our people and our country are marching firmly along the path of communist building, fulfilling the targets of the 10th 5-Year Plan and the party's designs. Soviet people and our friends abroad may be confident that our Leninist foreign policy course is unshakable. It is determined by the decisions of the CPSU congresses and is embodied in all our foreign policy activity. This course combines consistent love of peace with a firm rebuff of aggression. It has given a good account of itself in past decades and we will continue to follow it. No one will deflect us from this course."

ARTICLES CRITICIZE U.S. REACTION, POSITION ON AFGHANISTAN

Beglov Interview

AU181306 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 15 Jan 80 p 5 AU

[RABOTNICHESKO DELO interview with Spartak Beglov, political observer of the NOVOSTI news agency, "Counterrevolution for Export"--date and place of interview not given]

[Text] The Editorial Board of the daily RABOTNICHESKO DELO asked Spartak Beglov, political observer of the NOVOSTI news agency, for comment on the latest international events connected with the changes occurring in Afghanistan and with the new, "hard" line pursued by the U.S. administration in its foreign policy. This new line represents a serious threat against detente and actually means a return to the time of the "cold war." Beglov's answers read as follows:

The last political prisoners in Afghanistan, victims of the overthrown regime of Amin, have been released in Kabul. The louder the mourners hired by Washington cry for Amin, the more obvious becomes the participation of the United States in the cruel deeds of the upsurper Amin, who killed Taraki, the legitimate leader of the April 1978 revolution, a leader recognized by the people of Afghanistan. In their efforts to bring back the old regime to power, the ruling circles in Washington proved capable of any act. The terrorist gangs organized with the assistance of the United States and China on the territory of Pakistan killed members of the People's Democratic Party in Afghanistan and their families, as well as activists and supporters of the new government.

The more the smoke screen created by the anti-Soviet propaganda lifts the more clearly worldwide public opinion becomes aware of the fact that not an alleged threat is arising, but a real threat is arising caused by the actions of the imperialist circles.

On the eve of the new year, Harold Brown, U.S. defense secretary, pointed out that in the eighties Washington must become more "demanding" as regards its own "capacity to react in situations of crisis". This doctrine of "quick reaction," which was supported by the establishment of a special 110,000-men strong corps, contains new threats of exporting counterrevolution. Navy units are heading toward the Persian Gulf, a part of the 6th U.S. Fleet, which is based in the Mediterranean, is transferred nearer to Iran and another part was transferred to the shores of Turkey. In the Carribbean basin a series of demonstrations of U.S. military power has just ended aimed at intimidating Cuba, Nicaragua, Puerto Rico and all Latin Americans who cherish their freedom and independence. The emissaries of the Pentagon made tours of inspection to Somalia, Oman and Kenya in order to locate convenient U.S. bases along the African coast of the Indian Ocean. The U.S. military base on Diego Garcia, situated in the center of this ocean, is undergoing the last stage of its modernization.

Why has this area, all of a sudden, become so important to U.S. strategy? The answer to this question can be found in the comments of Beijing concerning the visit of U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown to China. The communique on the U.S.-Chinese negotiations points out the mutual "concern" about security in that area. The actual meaning of this sentence, however, becomes clear if we add that the United States is supplying Pakistan with weapons worth over $100 million. (Recent announcements state that this amount is likely to increase to $1 billion.) The United States also will continue to transfer terrorist gangs from Pakistan to the territory of Afghanistan.

"Arc of crisis"--is a term invented by Zbigniew Brzezinski that defines the area from South Africa to the foot of the Himalaya Mountains; this term also becomes a convenient pretext for the "quick reaction" doctrine, intended to impose the will of Washington on any country that could hamper Washington's policy, beginning with Delhi and ending at the Mekong Delta.

Once the Washington strategists used the term "doctrine of restraint," but now they have renamed it the "arc of crisis." Let us make a list of all their victims and targets: Guatemala--in 1952; Iran--in 1953; Congo-in 1960; Cuba--in 1961; the Dominican Republic--in 1965; Vietnam--in 1964 [order of preceding two countries as printed]; Kampuchea--in 1972; and Chile--in 1973.

As Max Lerner, the famous author of the classical work "History of American Civilization," wrote: Since the United States appeared on the worldwide political scene "it has forgotten its own revolutionary past and, to its great surprise, this country has found itself in a world involved in revolution."

The United States in the 20th century has assumed the role of tsarist Russia in the 19th century as regards the revolutionary processes of the epoch. The two countries have exchanged roles and are fulfilling two opposite missions today: The first socialist country in history is the loyal friend of national revolutions and democratic movements, while the main imperialist country is their gendarme and enemy. If the USSR did not exist, how many independent states would exist today? I think, many fewer than the ones existing today, whereas the dictatorial regimes supported by the United States would be two or three times more numerous.

In Brussels, where in the first days of the new year 1980 representatives of 15 Western countries met to discuss the "measures of reaction" to the Soviet international assistance to Afghanistan, it was not the NATO Council which was in session but the "Holy Alliance" of the 19th century.

The absolute majority of cases of national liberation from colonial oppression, as well as the cases of thorough social changes in all areas, from the Carribbean to the South China Sea, did not happen thanks to, but despite, the U.S. global policy. In this case we are talking not only of developing countries, but also of capitalist countries. When, in the middle of the sixties General de Gaulle adopted the courageous decision to withdraw France from the NATO military organization and to proceed along the path of detente with the East European countries, this was a revolutionary step in its own way, a step toward the liberation of Western Europe from U.S. dictation.

Against this background it is very obvious how the leaders of the FRG and Great Britain are retreating and how they are accepting their submission to the United States by assuming the role of vassals of American hegemony by consenting to have U.S. medium-range missiles installed on their countries' territories, as well as by declaring themselves in solidarity with the policy of Washington in Iran and Afghanistan.

The latest fit of political hysteria among the U.S. ruling circles is no less dangerous for the American people. The U.S. people's understanding of history and political realities is already distorted by the complex artificially instilled in the American people's minds that they are "exceptional." Last year Washington even found itself in the disgraceful situation of voting at the United Nations in favor of Kampuchean henchman Pol Pot, because this puppet of Beijing better served the interests of revenge against the anti-American liberation war that had been victorious in Indochina.

The artificially staged anti-Soviet and anti-Afghanistan propaganda campaign at the United Nations is one more attempt of the United States to distract the attention of worldwide public opinion from their intentions to make new attacks against revolution, democracy, and social changes from the Caribbean to Iran.

Administration-Orchestrated Campaign

LD211051 Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Jan 80 p 3 LD

[Dispatch by TRUD correspondent A. Repin: "On a Signal From the White House"]

[Text] Washington, 14 January--Bourgeois papers and television programs are offering Americans "cocktails" of chauvinist trash, anti-Soviet delirium and sickly jingoistic syrup which make all the tons of narcotics consumed in the United States look like child's play.

This campaign is being organized in the top echelons of the Washington administration. The recipes are compiled by the skillful hands of professionals at controlling people's minds. It is being carried out in the editorial offices of newspapers, news agencies and television stations with metronomic methodicalness.

Whatever they might say about private information organs being "independent" of the authorities, the fact is that this frenzy of malicious anti-Soviet propaganda--without parallel for many years--followed immediately on a signal from the White House.

It is on the initiative of and in accordance with direct, public pronouncements by the Washington administration that we Soviet people are being slandered, with accusations of "militarism," "expansion" and "hegemonism" leveled against the USSR by the very people who wear these epithets like birthmarks. The White House is threatening us with economic sanctions, forgetting that throughout its history Soviet power has seen a multitude of Chamberlains and is thus well able to survive the threats of their disciples.

The bellicose drum-beating broke out on the Potomac immediately after the beginning of the new stage of the revolution in Afghanistan. President Carter used the Afghan events as a pretext for taking a number of measures hostile to the Soviet Union which acted as the signal for a deafening explosion of propaganda hysteria in the United States.

In an interview for the ABC television company the U.S. President stated that his "view of the Russians has changed sharply" in recent days. This is his way of explaining to the American people the measures which have been taken by the Washington administration against the USSR and which threaten to destroy what has been created in Soviet-American relations through such great efforts over a period of many years.

But it was not just a couple of weeks ago that the winds of the cold war began to blow off the Potomac. The 3 years of Carter's administration show that the course toward confrontation with the Soviet Union to placate the U.S. military-industrial complex was set a long time ago. It is no accident that the present administration delayed the signing and is postponing the ratification of the SALT II treaty. It has imposed on the NATO countries the deployment of American nuclear missiles aimed at Soviet territory.

And what about the U.S. military budget, which has grown year by year to an unprecedented size? Was it elaborated 2 weeks ago in connection with the events in Afghanistan? Or a year ago, when the shah of Iran was overthrown?

The U.S. propaganda machine is pouring out more and more multiple doses of slander against the USSR. It is hard for Americans, who are kept on starvation rations when it comes to objective information while being fed with propaganda concoctions that suit the authorities and the monopolies, to comprehend the real course of events. [paragraph continues]

"It is very difficult for the average American," Carl Rowan writes in the Washington Star, "to correctly assess the actions taken by President Carter." But sooner or later life will demand such an assessment.

The measures announced by Carter on curtailing economic, scientific, technical and cultural ties are clearly unpopular with sober-minded Americans. The farmers are alarmed at the discontinuation of Soviet purchases of American grain. "Why do we have to pay for Washington's foreign policy blunders?" the leaders of the "American Agrarian Movement" farmers' organization ask with good reason. Almost all the U.S. presidential candidates from the Republican and Democratic parties adopted a critical stance on this question too. There were considerable rumblings in American business circles. Among businessmen, the Washington POST writes, there are demands for an end to the administration's interference in normal business relations with Soviet foreign trade organizations. In U.S. sporting circles there has been a violently adverse reaction to the President's threat to sabotage the Moscow Olympics.

But the louder the sober voices become the more the choir of anti-Sovietism roars. Cold war reservists are being thrown into the fray. "Teach the Russians a lesson," retired Lt Gen Authur Collins demands. "Our government," he orders, "must say outright that it will arm the Afghan rebels. The Soviet Union must be made aware that the United States is prepared to keep the Afghan cauldron at boiling-point." Having provided this recipe, which the White House had already adopted anyway, the general ordered propagandists: "The United States must launch a massive VOA campaign directed at several audiences at once, including the Afghans, other Muslims, Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union...."

To the delight of people like Collins CBS television repeated several times the monstrous fabrication "about shootings" allegedly carried out by Soviet soldiers in Afghanistan. This was "made known by an administration representative who wished to remain anonymous" and who apparently knew where this had taken place "only he did not say exactly where in order not to blow the cover of a CIA agent working there." However hard the authors of these vile fabrications try to conspire they can clearly be traced to Langley and the headquarters of the CIA.

Is the end of this provocative campaign in sight? Americans have an expression: Crises occur in presidential election years. The elections are an internal matter for the United States. But this year the incumbent presidential candidate is clearly trying to prolong his White House lease by "flexing his muscles" in the international arena. Obviously it is much more difficult to win points off rivals on domestic problems. The notorious "firmness" which for a long time professional politicians did not recognize in Carter and which he is now hastily acquiring by fanning anti-Sovietism and chauvinism threatens tc cost Americans and the cause of universal peace dear.

Sisnev Review

LD181559 Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Jan 80 p 1 LD

[V. Sisnev untitled "International Review"]

[Excerpt] Washington's "Boomerang"

"Why does the United States consider it has the right to be indignant when Afghanistan, a country that has been friendly toward us for many decades, asks us for military assistance and we give this assistance after weighing all the circumstances?"--writes G.S. Chepius, team leader of the Glavmosstroy Administration on the route of the Baykal-Amur Main Railroad (Tynda).

I believe that Washington was aware of the shakiness of its current arguments even before it began its massive bombardment of the consciousness of ordinary Americans with these apologies for "arguments." Evidently not yet foreseeing such a sharp shift on the White House's part, the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, the journal of American business circles, quite recently wrote literally the following: "Washington officials privately admit that they have no legitimate grounds for protesting the Russians' presence in Afghanistan, particularly as they were invited by that country's government itself." Moreover, the Western press, including the American press, was not particularly backward in writing about the undeclared war against revolutionary Afghanistan which imperialism had started along with its accomplices.

Our reviews have repeatedly drawn attention to the subversive actions being conducted against Afghanistan from the territory of neighboring states--Pakistan, above all--which are directed and financed from across the ocean and from Beijing. As long ago as the end of last July we analyzed the danger posed to the gains of the April revolution by 20 military camps set up in Pakistan by the CIA to train interventionist groups. It was pointed out that the main headquarters of the Afghan counterrevolution was in Peshawar, in a house leased by an American official.

Approximately 1 month later TRUD's readers were informed that U.S. Deputy Secretary of State W. Christopher had arrived in Pakistan specially to demand assistance from that country's government in getting weapons to Afghan counterrevolutionaries. Under this pressure invasion detachment training centers came into being in the region of the Pakistani cities of Peshawar, Chitral, Drosh, (Perashivar) [possibly, Parachinar] and Quetta and in other border centers. For it was not by chance that the WPC considered it necessary last summer to raise its voice in Afghanistan's defense by organizing in Kabul an international conference of solidarity with its people.

But now we hear from Washington that no one, as it turns out, was threatening the Afghan revolution and that the "threat," you see, arose in connection with the Soviet Union's agreeing to give friendly Afghanistan military assistance. Well, a threat really did arise--a threat to the plans nurtured deep within the Pentagon and the CIA to smother the Afghan revolution as the same hands had smothered the Chilean people's freedom. The Washington politicians' current anger, their unfounded attacks on the USSR and their attempts to poison the international atmosphere result from the latest failure of their own aggressive designs, as well as the desire to divert world public attention from American military preparations in the Near East.

Any unprejudiced person can see that the national interests or security of the United States and other states are in no way affected by the events in Afghanistan. Any attempts to depict the matter otherwise appear absurd, just like Washington's attempts to "punish" independent sovereign states by means of economic and political sanctions. By acting in this way the American administration is launching a kind of boomerang which will inevitably strike those who launched it. All this can achieve in reality is to strengthen the opinion of the United States as an unreliable partner who is capable on some whim of canceling his international obligations and thereby exerting a dangerous destabilizing influence on the whole international situation.

Beijing Yes-Men....

"Why at the very height of the hysteria induced by Washington has U.S. Defense Secretary Brown suddenly found it necessary to visit Beijing"--writes L.I. Kiryasova, silk combine weaver (Dushanbe).

At this stage it is hard to sort out who is playing which "card"--Washington the China card or Beijing the U.S. card. But that is not so important. It is clear that the anti-Soviet "holy alliance" of the hegemonists of the Western and Eastern hemispheres has taken shape de facto if not pro forma. This visit which Brown has just concluded is an example of this.

It is quite obvious that one of the aims of the anti-Soviet hysteria being fanned by Washington is to expedite and justify the military alliance with Beijing. This is precisely how many Western commentators regard the results of the U.S. defense secretary's trip. West Germany's DIE WELT, for example, believes that "Brown has found actual allies in China. There is complete harmony of interests. Both countries adhere to the same positions regarding the USSR." And a commentary on Britain's BBC television stated: the U.S. and Chinese positions on Afghanistan are so close that it is already possible to speak of the formation of a new military alliance between Washington and Beijing. The same television company reported in one of its broadcasts that they have adopted a decision on joint aid to the Afghan counterrevolutionaries.

In other words, whereas previously Washington and Beijing considered it sufficient for each to conduct its own subversive operations against people's Afghanistan, now it has been decided to inflict these foul stabs in the backs of the people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan together, in coordination. We see that those very people who have recently been more loudly indignant than anyone about imaginary Soviet "interference" are themselves interfering in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

Imperialist and also Beijing propaganda are deliberately and shamelessly distorting the Soviet Union's role in Afghan affairs, just as they distort it in any other matter. The conduct of the Chinese rulers in this case only increases the list of betrayals of the cause of the oppressed people's struggle.

ZORIN COMMENTS ON 'RASH' U.S. REACTIONS TO AFGHAN EVENTS

LD200044 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 19 Jan 80 LD

["Moscow Viewpoint" commentary by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] I am not a man who enjoys gambling but I know that among those who do, some are more cautious than others. The more cautious avoid tempting fate a second time if they had no luck the first. The others keep raising the stakes until finally they lose a fortune. The Washington administration appears to be just such a stake-everything gambler.

The crisis in relations with Iran is unquestionably a major loss for the American leadership. But your media are fanning such a hysteria that perhaps you have given no thought to the root causes of this setback. The issue is not just the seizure of the American Embassy in Tehran and the holding of hostages. Agreed, this is a violation of international law but it should not be viewed apart from all that went before. Remember that the U.S. Government had interfered in the affairs of Iran for years. Through the Central Intelligence Agency it arranged the overthrow of the legitimate Iranian Government under Dr Mossadeq and reinstated the shah, who had fled from Iran in 1953.

The United States also practiced other forms of both open and secret interference in the affairs of Iran. Finally, all these actions boomeranged. But instead of recognizing America's mistakes and its guilt before the Iranian people, the present administration raised the stakes in its dangerous political game until finally it produced one of the most acute crises in the history of American foreign policy.

The U.S. Embassy in Tehran was seized weeks ago but there is still no solution in sight. The administration in Washington shows no sign of a sober-minded approach that might help to adjust the situation. Instead the public of America is showing signs of dissatisfaction with the White House moves. When the crisis first broke the appeals for unity in the face of the threat to the embassy hostages seemed to be winning public support but now the White House is coming under mounting criticism for its inability to solve a problem that disturbs millions of Americans.

In these circumstances, as I see it, the White House decided to raise the stakes in its dangerous political game by using the excuse of the events in Afghanistan. In themselves these events gave President Carter no reason whatever to switch from negotiation to confrontation with the Soviet Union and thereby greatly worsen the international situation. President Brezhnev pointed out just a few days ago that the events in Afghanistan do not affect either the national interests or the security of the United States and other nations and it is absurd to try to make it look as though they did. Such attempts, he said, are being made with malicious intent so that it will be easier to carry out imperialistic schemes. On the other hand, Afghanistan is a neighbor of the Soviet Union. Hence events there have a direct bearing on the Soviet Union's national security.

Many people wonder why President Carter and his evil genius, Mr Brzezinski, decided to exploit the events in Afghanistan to turn around relations with the Soviet Union and strike at the lessening of world tension. When it comes to Brzezinski, I have met him and have heard and read his statements. My impression is that this emigre from East Europe is guided not so much by the national interests of the United States, where he became a naturalized citizen in his mature years, as by the prejudices and feelings of a person who fled from revolution.

As for Mr Carter, I believe one of the chief reasons for his unbalanced approach to important world issues is the fear that the stalemate in relations with Iran and the administration's obvious inability to find a solution may affect his chances of returning to the White House after this year's elections.

This is not the sole reason, of course. There must be a whole complex of reasons, oversights and mistakes, but I feel certain that election considerations have played a significant part.

The White House also has a definite political purpose in over-reacting to the events in Afghanistan and making them the focus of a hysterical propaganda campaign. This purpose is to distract public attention from the Iranian stalemate and raise the anti-Soviet hysteria a few degrees more and thereby avoid having to explain the reasons for the American-Iranian crisis and how the White House intends to solve the crisis.

There is little doubt that these rash actions of the administration will produce no long-term effects on the election campaign in America. Sooner or later the excitement will subside and those who staked everything on it will have to deal with its consequences and these consequences may be long-term. It required a tremendous effort and much political courage and vision on the part of America's leaders, too, to turn away from cold war and lay the foundation for a policy of reducing world tension, a policy in which Americans must be as much interested as the people of the Soviet Union and other nations.

It's always easier to destroy than to build and it takes time. If American leaders think that whenever they find it to their advantage they can effect another rightabout-face in relations with the Soviet Union, they are under a delusion. The Soviet Union will long feel resentment at their present actions.

Only chauvinistic arrogance can prompt the assumption that the men in Washington have the right to punish or reward other countries as they see fit and especially such a mighty power as the Soviet Union.

The actions of the Carter administration, as President Brezhnev has pointed out, create the impression in the world that the United States is a totally unreliable partner in intergovernmental relations and that, moved by whims, caprices or outbursts of emotion or by considerations of the moment, it's capable any time of violating international commitments and scrapping treaties and agreements it has signed. The Carter administration will not achieve the home and foreign goals it hopes to with its latest actions but the negative consequences of these actions will long be felt in world politics and the people in whose name the administration is acting will have to pay for them.

FAILURE TO SERVICE AEROFLOT PLANE AT NEW YORK NOTED

LD191221 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0837 GMT 19 Jan 80 LD

[Text] New York, 19 January, TASS--There is no end to the blatant anti-Soviet provocations in the United States. At New York International Airport local services, with the knowledge and approval of the authorities, refused to handle an Aeroflot plane which arrived on a scheduled flight.

For several hours the Soviet airliner remained unloaded and was not refueled for the return flight. Passenger and luggage registration was also sabotaged. It was only thanks to the efforts of Soviet officials of the New York Aeroflot office, who did all the work themselves, that the airliner was able to take off for Moscow, 7 hours late.

Among the passengers bound for the Soviet Union was a large group of American tourists who became unwilling victims of the provocation. Here are quotations from some of them. Michael F., an engineer from Connecticut: "I cannot approve the actions of the airport authorities in detaining the aircraft. I am sure that they were sanctioned from above and pursue the obvious aim of further heating up the atmosphere of anti-Sovietism in the United States. I assure you that in spite of press claims by no means all Americans support the course taken by the administration for the revival of the cold war with the Soviet Union."

Catherine U., a housewife from Ohio: "This is the first time I am flying to your country, where I have dreamed of going for many years. Very unfortunately the start of the journey has been clouded by this unpleasant incident. I am indignant at the disgraceful actions of the authorities!"

IZVESTIYA RIDICULES U.S. CLAIM TO 'DEFEND ISLAM' IN IRAN

LD220947 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 5 LD

[M. Zubko article under the rubric "International Notes": "The Masquerade Will Not Help You, Gentlemen"]

[Text] There is a masquerade in Washington again: Scenes from the hypocritical show entitled "the United States in defense of Islam" are being played out noisily and stridently there.

The United States in defense of Islam? Surely not? Probably Washington supposes that the peoples have a short memory, that they have already had time to forget how the United States outraged the people of an Islamic country like Iran, for instance. Let us recall the year 1951. The government of Mohammed Mossadeq, which expressed the interests of the national bourgeoisie, came to power in Iran on the crest of an anti-imperialist movement. This government nationalized the country's oil industry, in which British capital ruled.

These actions displeased Britain, which sent warships to the Persian Gulf (history, as we can see, is now repeating itself with U.S. participation). London appealed to the Security Council (here too Washington, as we can see, is not being original) and broke off diplomatic relations with Iran.

History proclaims that Mossadeq cherished illusions regarding possible U.S. aid to Iran. On 28 May 1953 his government appealed to Washington either to bring influence to bear on the British authorities to make them leave Iran in peace, or to grant Iran financial aid.

How did the United States treat this request from the Islamic people of Iran? It betrayed them most perfidiously with a stab in the back. The United States not only failed to respond to Iran's appeal but, with CIA aid, organized a plot against Mossadeq's government and overthrew it. The power of the monopolies and the shah, who was on the point of fleeing the country, was saved. Mass repressions began in the country. And it was only after this that the United States...granted Iran financial aid.

Now everyone recognizes the CIA's sinister role. TIME magazine recently coined the phrase: "The shah was really a loyal U.S. ally, and he was restored to his throne with the aid of a military plot organized by the CIA." Returned to the throne, the shah plunged the country into the abyss of the cruellest terror, and the United States (for the sake of the defense of Islam) trained its executioners in the most refined methods of torture. Iranian Foreign Minister Qotbzadeh stated recently that the executioners' art was the element of American "civilization" which Iran received from the United States.

The shah and his secret police, SAVAK, murdered people. In their last 2 years alone, according to Ayatollah Khomeyni, the shah's punitive corps killed over 60,000 (!) people and maimed over 100,000. And, as the same TIME magazine asserts, the last seven U.S. presidents have praised the shah. In defense of Islam!

The shah ordered the secret police: "Take no prisoners. They must be shot." And U.S. President Carter said in a talk with the shah in 1977: "Iran is an island of stability in one of the world's most troubled regions. This, your majesty, is to your credit and to the credit of your government and is the result of the respect, admiration and love which your people have for you."

The people of the Islamic country did not respect the shah and did not love him. The Iranians regarded him as a criminal and demanded his overthrow. Mass demonstrations against the shah's tyranny began in Iran. Demonstrators were shot and blood was shed. Yet Washington continued to give ostentatious signs of attention to the shah and expressed itself in support of Prime Minister Bakhtiar's government, which tried to execute the shah's will for the defense of Islam!

It is presumably precisely for the sake of defending Islam that the U.S. authorities are now maintaining off Iran's shores a warship armada unprecedented in peace time. The United States has already been an accomplice in the shah's crimes and his reprisals against hundreds of thousands of Iranians. And now, "for the defense of Islam," the United States is elaborating plans to bomb Iran's oilfields and cities.

No, gentlemen, the masquerade will not help you. You are too well known to be able to hide your true face behind the disguise of a masquerade.

U.S., BRITISH NAVAL ACTIVITY IN PERSIAN GULF REPORTED

LD182118 Moscow TASS in English 2050 GMT 18 Jan 80 LD

[Text] London, January 18, TASS--The U.S. naval forces concentrated in the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf area now consist of 25 ships, including three aircraft carriers.

Britain, in its turn, sent a tactical unit consisting of six ships into the area of the Mediterranean for possible actions in the Persian Gulf. Five of these ships must reach the Strait of Gibraltar. They will later be joined by a large landing ship Intrepid that can carry 700 marines, as well as tanks and heavy armaments.

U.S. and British monopolies were plundering Iran during the rule of the shah's regime, getting huge profits from capital invested in Iran, through exploiting natural wealth of that country, above all its oil. U.S. monopolies that had the right of selling Iranian oil were receiving profits amounting to eleven thousand million dollars a year. Fabulous profits were received by huge oil corporations Exxon, Gulf, Mobil Oil, Standard Oil of California, Texaco, the major banks, Chase Manhattan, the Rockefeller Bank and others. And though U.S. capital managed to crowd British capital considerably, British industrial tycoons were grasping any occasion to get profit from Iranian oil, from the deliveries of armaments and equipment.

The fall of the shah's regime meant for U.S. and British monopolies the loss of huge profits, of an advantageous market. This made them and the ruling circles of the two countries behind them hate the new Iranian Government. The question of hostages served for Washington merely as a pretext for unleashing the campaign of threats and the shows of strength against Iran to whose shores Washington sent large naval forces.

Following the United States, Britain is now starting shows of strength. The British press writes openly today that British ships are on the way to be linked with the U.S. 6th Fleet in the Eastern Mediterranean and can be urgently brought into operation in the Persian Gulf and in the Adriatics.

The history of the USA and Britain contains many examples when leaders of these countries, motivated by the interests of monopolies, resorted to gunboat policy. It is well known that this policy invariably resulted in defeats. In this case, Iran declared firmly that no threats of force, no attempts to stifle it with economic sanctions can make it abandon the chosen road.

INDIAN OCEAN BUILD UP 'THREAT' TO USSR'S SECURITY

LD211249 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 4 LD

[M. Rostarchuk article under the rubric "On International Topics": "In Militarist Ecstasy"]

[Text] The militarist trends in U.S. policy, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev stressed in answering a PRAVDA correspondent's questions, have recently been reflected in the creation of new military bases far beyond the United States, including in the Indian Ocean, and in the formation of the so-called "quick reaction corps"--that instrument of the policy of military intervention.

The escalation of the U.S. military presence in the Indian Ocean began back in the mid-sixties. All this time the U.S. administration, irrespective of who has occupied the President's seat in the White House, has opposed by any means the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace and has wrecked the Soviet-U.S. talks on questions of limiting military activity in this region. Despite protests from the international public and in violation of the UN resolution, Washington has built up its military potential here and actively expanded its military base on Diego Garcia, which has now become the main U.S. military stronghold in the central Indian Ocean.

The United States is seeking to use the Iranian-U.S. crisis and the events in Afghanistan to strengthen the Pentagon's positions in the region still further.

Even U.S. officials are not hiding this. Indeed, the largest number of U.S. warships in U.S. history is now concentrated in the waters of the Arabian Sea; last month President Carter announced specific plans for the creation of "quick reaction forces" numbering 100,000 men. He also supported the Pentagon's demand for the even greater expansion of the base on Diego Garcia, which is to become "a connecting link between all existing and future U.S. military bases from Japan to Africa."

The U.S. administration is now seeking the "right" to use port and airfield installations in Oman, Kenya and Somalia for U.S. air and naval forces which will now be permanently stationed in the Indian Ocean. The sinister web of U.S. bases which have covered the world and house over 400,000 servicemen will thus be extended still further. To this we should add two fleets and a combat formation of ships constantly cruising far from U.S. shores. In other words, as the New York TIMES explains, Washington has adopted a strategic concept whereby the United States must be able "to use military force to back up its diplomatic efforts" and also to increase its military potential sufficiently " to have the opportunity to intervene in the Near East or any other part of the world."

It is perhaps impossible to formulate the present U.S. administration's credo more clearly: Is it worth mentioning how dangerous to the fate of the peoples of Asia and Africa this aggressive course is--a course steered under the imperialist slogan of "defense of U.S. interests." The escalation of U.S. military might in this region cannot fail to be regarded also as a threat to the security of the Soviet Union, whose borders are close enough to the region where U.S. military bases and naval forces are deployed and which uses the Indian Ocean as the only nonfreezing sea route uniting two of its parts--the European and Far Eastern region.

Finally, the U.S. military's aggressive plans are in flagrant contradiction with the opinion of the absolute majority of UN members, who advocate the implementation of the declaration on proclaiming the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. The question naturally arises in this connection: Is the present U.S. administration not assuming excessive responsibility in attempting, in a militarist ecstasy, to turn the Indian Ocean into the Pentagon's private domain, thus issuing such a blatant challenge to the peace-loving peoples of Asia and Africa?

INITIALING OF U.S.-TURKEY AGREEMENTS ON BASES OBSERVED

LD212106 Moscow TASS in English 1647 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Text] New York, January 21, TASS--U.S. representatives recently initialled four agreements with the Turkish Government. According to today's New York TIMES, these agreements, among others, provide for subsidies and credits to Turkey to the tune of 450 million dollars to purchase new weapons and equipment as well as to grant the United States the use of Turkish bases to gather reconnaissance data and possibly to pursue operations in the Middle East. Final details of the agreements, especially with regard to bases are in the words of the newspaper expected to be elaborated in mid-February. In the course of the negotiations with the Turkish side Washington representatives are trying to intimidate Turkey by "a Soviet military threat" hoping that such tactics will make it easy for them to draw Turkey into the orbit of U.S. military activities. However, the newspaper points out, Turkey is rather wary approach [as received] to the idea of offering its military bases to Washington to be used in conflicts which do not touch directly on its interests. Of late the United States stepped up its quest for new strongholds for a military interference in the internal affairs of Middle East countries. Last week a Pentagon delegation arrived in the countries of Eastern Africa and the Middle East to study possibilities for utilization by the Pentagon of naval and airforce bases in the area. Previously U.S. emissaries with similar assignments visited Oman, Kenya and Somalia. Such activities of the United States, which already has 400 military bases in 30 countries of the world, clearly shows who threatens peace and security of the peoples.

POLITICAL OFFICER SAYS PRC-USSR BORDER SITUATION 'TENSE'

OW220606 Vladivostok Domestic Service in Russian 0215 GMT 18 Jan 80 OW

[Summary] "The 11th District Komsomol Conference of the Red Banner Pacific Border District has been held in Vladivostok. A serious and deep analysis of Komsomol work in the district was made by Major Gayevoy, assistant chief of the district political department for Komsomol work. Addressing the conference, Dmitriy Alekseyevich Okhromiy, secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, lauded the efforts of Komsomol member Sergeant Aleksandr Klimakhin who was a delegate at the conference and who has achieved excellent results in combat and political training and shares his experience with young troops.

"It was quite natural that when a border guard detail--which included Aleksandr Klimakhin--met a violator of the USSR state border, the border guard acted boldly and resolutely in accordance with all the rules of border guard science."

Before concluding, the conference was addressed by Major General Nazarov, chief of the Political Department of the district. [begin Nazarov recording] "The situation on the border, comrades, remains difficult and tense. Today the border has become the place where the militarist course of the United States, Japanese revanchism and the anti-Sovietism and hostility to the Soviet system of the Chinese leadership are openly manifested. There are many interesting examples among the district's troops characterizing the service of our people. They are evidence of the increased border guard skill of personnel, their military knowledge and excellent physical stamina. If you like, this is an example of courage, staunchness and heroism in our time of our youth." [end recording] The conference has ended its work.

GLEBOV COMMENTARY: BROWN SABOTAGED SOVIET-CHINESE TALKS

OW211722 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 1430 GMT 21 Jan 80 OW

[Text] The spokesman for the Information Department of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs has said that "it is inappropriate to hold the second round of Sino-Soviet talks at present." In other words, the Beijing leadership actually has unilaterally refused to hold Soviet-Chinese talks. The first round of Soviet-Chinese talks was held in Moscow and the second should be held in Beijing. In this connection, station commentator Glebov writes:

When Mao Zedong changed China's course by pursuing an anti-Soviet, anti-socialist policy at the turn of the 1950's and the 1960's, the imperialists did not at all conceal their delight. U.S. observer (Chulanteer) once said: "We should thank Mao Zedong in many aspects. We should first thank him for undermining the Soviet-Chinese monolithic bloc, which does not benefit us at all."

From these remarks it can be seen that the imperialists--especially the U.S. imperialists--have tried by hook or by crook to obstruct the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations and to intensify the contradictions between the Soviet Union and China. This has been one of their major tasks. Mao Zedong's successors are even more submissive to imperialism and more hostile to socialism than he was. They hold that it is better for them to go along with Washington in carrying out anti-Soviet activities on a large scale. As a result, China depends ever more on the imperialist monopoly group economically and is doing everything it can to help the imperialists and reactionaries oppose peace, socialism and the progressive forces.

U.S. Secretary of Defense Brown recently visited China. The results of this visit show that the U.S. imperialists have made tremendous progress in using the Chinese leaders and their policies to serve their own purposes and interests. The Pentagon chief (?may brag) that the United States has assigned to China a large portion of the task of obstructing the Afghan revolution.

No sooner had Brown left China than the Beijing leadership sent Huang Hua to Pakistan. The purpose of this trip is to coordinate anti-Afghan activities, to work out concrete measures and to discuss and determine the amount of weapons China will provide to the mercenaries and bandits and the time for it to do so. These mercenaries and bandits are undergoing training in preparation for raids and aggressive activities against Democratic Afghanistan.

As a matter of fact, Brown's visit to China was aimed at killing two birds with one stone--he wanted China not only to pull the United States' chestnuts out of the fire but to oppose the Afghan revolution ever more frenziedly so that China would ruin its own reputation.

When the U.S. imperialist clique dispatched Brown to hold talks with the Chinese leaders, he undoubtedly did everything he could to sabotage the Soviet-Chinese talks. This is because these talks do not accord with the interests and purposes of the imperialists. Facts show that the U.S. imperialists have achieved certain results in this regard.

It is very obvious that the Chinese leaders are blindly following imperialism's reactionary policy and betraying the interests of porletarian internationalism and socialism. China's policy is apparently in keeping with that of the United States, which will cause very dangerous consequences for China and its people. No matter how the Chinese social renegades whitewash their principles, the nature of imperialism does not change. It is still the most heinous enemy of the people in the world--of course, the Chinese people too. Many people in China do not believe the anti-Soviet propaganda and know and are convinced that the Soviet Union is the most steadfast and reliable friend and ally of the Chinese people in their opposition against the imperialists and reactionaries and struggle for socialism. The imperialist camp also knows this. For this reason, the imperialists have done their utmost to undermine Soviet-Chinese relations. In going along with the imperialist anti-Soviet elements and lessening their difficulties in carrying out the design to control China, the Beijing leaders are doing exactly what the Chiang gang did during its reign of China--turning China into a vassal state of the U.S. imperialists.

LOSEV HITS BEIJING POLICY AS 'NARROWMINDED NATIONALISM'

OW192158 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0900 GMT 19 Jan 80 OW

[Losev commentary: "Leninism Is Loyal to Proletarian Internationalism, While Mao Zedong's Line Aims at Colluding With Imperialism"]

[Summary] Lenin developed the thinking that all fighters for social progress and all anti-imperialist forces must be unified. He supported, without reservation, the slogan "Let All the Proletariat and Suppressed People Throughout the World Unite."

Today, whoever pays attention to international developments will find Lenin's principles well-founded and meaningful. Imperialist forces continue to direct the spearhead of their aggressive policy at worldwide socialism and continue to assault national liberation movements.

"Chinese leaders also speak of supporting the anti-imperialist peoples. However, news from China exposes almost daily the true nature of its line of directly uniting and colluding with imperialism. It is by no means accidental that the chieftains of NATO, an imperialist military bloc serving the interests of U.S. imperialism, regard China as a new member of their aggressive alliance.

"It is true that the goal of the Beijing ruling circles' long-term diplomatic efforts is to struggle against worldwide socialism and the national liberation movement. In 1979, China launched a naked aggression against Socialist Vietnam. Now, in collusion with U.S. imperialism, China is attempting to sabotage the revolutionary achievements of the Afghan people who have been following the brilliant road to social progress since the 1978 April revolution. For a long time, the Beijing ruling circles supported the former shah's antipeople regime. Following his escape from Iran, documents were found in the Iranian capital that verified the Chinese secret service had kept close cooperative relations with both the Iranian secret police and the U.S. CIA. It is natural that the goal being pursued by the Beijing ruling circles, which serves imperialist interests and brings disasters upon the Chinese people--is narrow-minded nationalism and adventurism and is also dangerous to China herself. Furthermore, practice has repeatedly proven that collusion with imperialism will not bring any good results to its junior partners.

"In their relations with imperialism, the Beijing ruling circles can only play the role of junior partner. Flattering imperialism surely will lead to the betrayal of national interests. The following is a recent example: During Secretary of Defense Brown's visit in China, the U.S. ruling circles decided to abolish the ban on arms sales to the Taiwan regime. Arms sales to Taiwan were banned following establishment of diplomatic relations with China, but now the ban has been lifted. What was the reaction from Beijing? Its leaders have obediently accepted the will of U.S. imperialism because they intend to obtain arms from the United States. According to estimates by U.S. experts, China may spend some $63 billion for these arms.

"The Beijing ruling cricles hesitate to allocate money to meet the working people's logical demand for quick and substantial improvement in their life but they are willing to spend freely for military goods and are ready to use a large amount of foreign currency for militarization. Furthermore, U.S. imperialism regards China as a source of cannon fodder. For example, U.S. Senator Jackson has made the serious estimate that, after all, how many troops can be deployed by China? Because of the Beijing ruling circles' proimperialist policy, the Chinese people sacrificed the lives of their soldiers. The Beijing ruling circles resumed the job U.S. imperialism had long planned to do, that is, teach Vietnam a lesson. However, they did not succeed. As Chen Yun pointed out at a Party Central Committee meeting in the spring of 1979: The war against Vietnam did not bring victory to these leaders. Deng Xiaoping also was compelled to admit that China suffered losses.

YAKOVLEV CRITICIZES PRC MIDEAST, SOUTH ASIA MOVES

LD181726 Moscow TASS in English 1544 GMT 18 Jan 80 LD

["Henchmen of Imperialism"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, January 18, TASS--TASS Commentator Mikhail Yakovlev writes:

The foreign minister of the People's Republic of China is going to Pakistan to coordinate actions against Afghanistan.

The Egyptian minister of state for foreign affairs, Butrus Ghali, said in the Egyptian Parliament that "Egypt and China are coordinating their efforts in settling a number of problems including the Afghan one." All this indicates that the Beijing leaders are actively and increasingly openly involved in the joint subversive actions of the imperialist forces and right-wing reaction against a sovereign and independent state, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. It is well known that American, Egyptian and Pakistani officers are forming in the territories of Pakistan and China armed units and sabotage groups out of Afghan counterrevolutionaries in order to smuggle them into Afghanistan and thus try by joint efforts to undermine the people's revolution in Afghanistan, to overthrow the Government of the DRA and to turn that country into an imperialist place d'armes.

Characteristically, a similar hostile policy is being pursued by the Chinese leadership--jointly with imperialism--with regard to the people's revolution in Iran. After the flight of the Iranian shah, documents were found in Tehran testifying to close cooperation of Chinese special services with the CIA and the Iranian secret police SAVAK. Beijing comes out for the further buildup of U.S. military presence in the Persian Gulf. This creates an immediate danger to the security of Iran while China's move in avoiding the voting in the U.N. Security Council on the American draft resolution concerning an economic blockade against Iran was tantamount to the adoption of economic sanctions against that country.

In the Middle East, Beijing ispursuing a provocative, treacherous policy that hampers the just struggle of the Arab peoples for eliminating the consequences of Israel's aggression. It did not accede to any of the U.N. resolutions demanding withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territories and refused to support the General Assembly's appeal for ensuring the right to self-determination for the Arab people of Palestine. At the same time, China applauds the separate Camp David collusion which was denounced by the entire Arab world.

Thus, Beijing became an ally of imperialism, a force hostile to peace and the security of the peoples and the national liberation movement. It expresses readiness to take part in imperialist intervention to suppress this movement. Is this not evidenced by the admission of Afghan counter-revolutionaries that the anti-government armed formations operating in the territory of Afghanistan include Chinese instructors?

U.S.-JAPANESE PLANS FOR 'PACIFIC COMMUNITY' THREATEN PEACE

LD211109 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 5 LD

[Correspondent Yu. Bandura dispatch under the rubric "Problems and Opinions": "Plot on the Pacific"]

[Text] Tokyo--The representative "Group to Study Cooperation in the Pacific Ocean Basin" created in Japan on the personal instructions of Prime Minister M. Ohira has conveyed to the head of government its recommendations on the so-called "concept of circular Pacific solidarity." Its essence is simple and boils down to the creation of a "regional community" in the Pacific and adjacent regions. In other words--a bloc of states for which, as the authors of the report put it, "the very vast ocean which has so far divided the countries of the Pacific region is now becoming rather their inland sea."

The recommendations submitted to the Japanese Government do not say precisely which countries Japan would like to see in the grouping. An analysis of the document, however, leads us to conclude that the authors of the concept leave no room for the socialist countries to participate in "Pacific Ocean cooperation." The report emphasizes that "there must be constant coordination of efforts bearing in mind the conservation and strengthening of the free international economic system," that is, the capitalist system.

At a press conference for foreign journalists, (E. Sakakibara), spokesman for the team of authors, enumerated the potential members--Japan, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Chile, South Korea, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations [ASEAN] countries. Thus no doubt remains that it is a case of creating an alliance into which the industrially developed countries of the region and the developing countries of Southeast Asia and Latin America would be drawn under the auspices of the world's leading imperialist countries--the United States and Japan. Here the main emphasis is placed on economic goals.

In this connection we cannot bypass the actions in this direction which are being taken on the other side of the ocean. In June last year the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee for East Asian and Pacific Affairs advanced a similar concept. It is the originator of the idea of creating OPTAD--the "Organization for Pacific Ocean Trade and Development" consisting of the same five developed capitalist states of the Pacific Ocean Basin, the ASEAN countries, South Korea, Taiwan, and Micronesia. The Pacific Basin Economic Council--an organization of leading representatives of the private capital sector of 20 countries in which the U.S. and Japanese monopolies play first fiddle--also began to speak of lending concrete form to plans to create a "Pacific common market."

How realistic are these plans? A struggle has already begun for hegemony in the planned bloc between Washington and Tokyo. There are very sharp contradictions between the imperialist states on the one hand and the developing countries which it is intended to draw into the "community" on the other. The bloc's initiators are not totally clear about China, which itself lays claim to the role of hegemonic force in this region.

Evidently understanding how tangled this knot of contradictions is, Japanese Prime Minister M. Ohira, in accepting the group's recommendations, noted: "This concept should be approached from the viewpoint of long-term, 21st-century prospects." However, it remains a fact that Tokyo and Washington are already starting to knock together a large imperialist bloc in the Pacific. The question of the bloc was discussed in Tokyo in early January during a visit by a U.S. delegation headed by L. Wolff, chairman of the Congressional Foreign Affairs Committee Subcommittee for Asian and Pacific Affairs. [paragraph continues]

The same question, according to the newspapers, will occupy a considerable place at Prime Minister Ohira's talks during his visit to Australia and New Zealand. But whereas the aims of economic integration are pushed beyond the framework of this century, aims of a far more sinister nature--military aims--are becoming the force even in our day. Indeed, they have been doing so particularly actively recently.

The Pacific Ocean is quite well enmeshed in the web of military treaties and greements linking many states of the region with the United States. There is the Japanese-U.S. "security treaty", the United States' treaty relations with the Philippines, South Korea and Taiwan; and the ANZUS military bloc consisting of the United States, Australia and New Zealand. This system has been in existence for several decades now but recently considerable changes have been observed.

First, the content of the Japanese-U.S. military alliance is changing qualitatively: After asserting "the guiding principles of defense cooperation" this alliance has discarded the mask of a "defensive" alliance and in fact is now becoming an aggressive alliance aimed against other countries. Second, since the summer of 1979 through the efforts of Washington and Tokyo, the Japanese-U.S. alliance has been gradually beginning to become a three-sided alliance--Seoul is being involved. Third, Japan's agreement to include its naval forces in the annual multilateral maneuvers held in the central Pacific by the ANZUS countries essentially signifies Japan's involvement in this bloc.

Behind these actions we can glimpse very clearly intentions to create in the Pacific Ocean a large-scale military bloc of imperialist states which the press has already dubbed JANZUS (a combination of the initials of Japan, Australia, New Zealand and the United States).

At the same time Washington is seeking to turn ASEAN--an organization of five Southeast Asian states--into a military alliance as soon as possible. The enthusiasm with which the United States sets the ASEAN countries against the peoples of Indochina is well known. The process of increasing U.S. arms supplies to the members of this grouping is underway at the same time. Military "aid" to Thailand this year will reach $400 million--four times the average annual dollar investment over the past 3 years. The Carter administration has submitted for congressional approval a project for considerably expanding military supplies to other ASEAN countries. The above-mentioned Congressman Wolff has also demanded the creation of a "Japanese-U.S. military fund" to finance the militarization of the Asian-Pacific region.

To the accompaniment of threats and promises from Washington some people in these countries are beginning to demand increasingly loudly ASEAN's transformation into a military bloc. From the pages of the STAR newspaper former Malaysian Prime Minister Rahman calls for the creation of a unified command for the ASEAN armed forces. The Japanese newspaper NIHON KEIZAI, quoting Thai Government circles, reports preparation for a conference of military ministers of the countries belonging to this organization.

The formation of JANZUS in the Pacific and attempts to militarize ASEAN in Southeast Asia.... It would seem that each of these phenomena has an independent nature. In reality the two processes are closely interconnected. Scarcely had he heard of Japan's readiness to become a permanent participant in the RIMPAC military maneuvers when U.S. Congressmen Findley came out with the "idea" of using "Japan's unprecedented step" to create a united naval squadron consisting of ships from the United States, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and...ASEAN.

The desire to hitch this organization to the imperialist military bloc can easily be observed also in the attempts to galvanize the so-called 1954 "Manila Treaty," which was the basis of the military alliance in the Asian and Pacific region--SEATO. As is known, SEATO's existence in fact ceased after the failure of the U.S. Vietnam aggression, but the champions of imperialist strategy in this region are still trying to rely on its "legal basis"--the Manila Treaty.

Following New Zealand Foreign Minister Talboys, in Washington Assistant Secretary of State Holbrooke confesses his love for the defunct bloc. He has confirmed the validity of the "Manila Treaty" for the United States. Thus a chain is being forged out of JANZUS, SEATO and ASEAN, a chain with whose help Washington is trying together with Tokyo to hitch the peoples of Asia to the chariot of military adventures.

It is not hard to understand the reasons why imperialist forces are starting to recarve the military-political map of the Asian and Pacific region. The chief reason is China's defection to positions of overt support for imperialism in its struggle against the world socialist system and against the national liberation movements in developing countries.

The members of the American delegation which visited China and Japan last April well remembered Deng Xiaoping's offer during their talks when he advocated creating relations between the United States and China directed against the USSR. Deng's appeal, by all accounts, has been heeded. The trip which U.S. Defense Secretary Brown has just concluded to Beijing leaves us in no doubt as to this.

These are the outlines of the "Pacific community" being projected in the U.S. and Japanese capitals--outlines which are not yet fully known but which are already showing through the haze. And even though the outlines of the structure which they intend to erect over the Asian and Pacific region are still dim and indistinct, it is impossible not to discern in them a serious danger to the cause of peace.

SOVIET, DPRK DEPUTY PREMIERS HOLD TALKS

SK200445 Moscow in Korean to Korea 0930 GMT 19 Jan 80 SK

[Text] Comrade Arkhipov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, yesterday held talks with Comrade Kong Chin-tae, vice premier of the DPRK Administration Council. Participating in the talks was Comrade Kim Chae-pong, DPRK ambassador to the Soviet Union.

FOREIGN MINISTER DOST SUPPORTS SOVIET ACTION IN AFGHANISTAN

ID211948 Moscow TASS in English 1749 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 21, TASS--The application to the Soviet Union for help is not a threat to peace and security in the region but on the contrary promotes stronger peace and stability in the whole world, said Shah Mohammed Dost, the DRA's minister of foreign affairs, in an interview with the BAKHTAR NEWS AGENCY.

It is imperialist and reactionary forces that create seats of tension and undermine the use of peace and security in our region, he stressed. It is they and not the Soviet Union that are putting peace and security in jeopardy. Our relations with the Soviet Union fully accord with the wishes of the two countries as well as with the traditions of friendship and brotherhood which have for long existed between the Soviet and Afghan peoples. At each difficult stage the Soviet Union rendered prompt and timely help to Afghanistan. It is due to such help that the outside threat which overshadowed our country's independence and sovereignty was staved off. The people and Government of the DRA highly appreciate the help.

The Afghan people, Shah Mohammed Dost emphasized in conclusion, feels and knows well that it has many friends. Those countries' friendship and fraternal assistance serve as a source of hopes and an immense strength to Afghanistan.

AFGHAN SECURITY OFFICIAL ON PRESENCE OF SOVIET TROOPS

ID211946 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Berlin, January 21, TASS--Abdossamad Azhar, chief of security bodies, member of the Revolutionary Council of Afghanistan, gave an interview to the television of the GDR. In the interview he touched upon the question of the temporary stay of the Soviet military contingent in the DRA. The task of the contingent is to repel any external aggression, he said. Soviet military units do not interfere in matters of our internal security and order and no necessity arose for us to ask for such an interference. Our people is seeing to its internal security and order itself.

Abdossamad Azhar emphasized that the Afghan people renders an increasing support to the new leadership and the April revolution with every passing day. This trust, he said, contributes to the successful solution of the task facing our country. The Afghan working people and the entire people are the main force on which we rely and which help maintain order and security.

KABUL PAPER CITED ON EXPULSION OF U.S. JOURNALISTS

ID211634 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Commenting on the decision of the leadership of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan to expel representatives of American information organs from the country, the paper Kabul NEW TIMES writes: The American journalists did not even attempt to gain an understanding of the new stage in Afghanistan's development. Instead, they became cheerleaders in the noisy propaganda campaign around the so-called Afghan question directed against the April revolution, a campaign started in the United States of America and the West. Articles in the New York TIMES, Washington POST and CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR confirm, emphasizes the paper, that the American journalists were sent to Afghanistan with the task of spreading slanderous conjectures and insinuations instead of reporting events.

CORRESPONDENTS REPORT 'PEACEFUL' AFGHAN CAPITAL

LD211630 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Excerpt] Kabul--Our special correspondents Farid Seyful-Mulyukov and Viktor Basilevich report: On these January days the Afghan capital looks surprisingly smart and peaceful. The city wakes early, even in the winter and from early morning its streets are busy. After all, the inhabitants of Kabul have many ordinary, everyday things to attend to: The stone houses have to be heated, the shopping has to be done and they have to get to work on time. The city is also busy because thousands of people are arriving here from the regions as they want to find out for themselves about the changes which have taken place and to tell the new authorities of the injustices of the Amin regime.

The present Afghan Government is approaching the numerous matters it has to deal with thoughtfully and objectively. Only those who perpetrated arbitrary actions and practiced coercion under Amin have been removed from their jobs in state institutions. Thousands of Afghan patriots freed from prisons have actively joined in the life of the country. Much has already been done during these weeks--Governing party and government bodies have been formed. The drafting of a genuinely Democratic Afghan Constitution has begun in Kabul. Necessary adjustments are being made to the 5-year economic development plan which was adopted soon after the victory of the April revolution. Its basic tasks are to eliminate the remnants of feudalism, strengthen the state sector of the economy, implement further stages of the democratic agrarian reform and encourage trade and small and medium-scale commerce. All this is being done for the sake of improving the life of the Afghan people and to restore peace and calm but the enemies of Democratic Afghanistan do not want this. They continue to devise intrigues and machinations against the Republic.

AFGHAN GOVERNMENT RELEASES PAKISTANI PRISONERS 'TO SHOW GOOD WILL'

ID221008 Moscow TASS in English 0916 GMT 22 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 22, TASS--The Government of Afghanistan issued a statement reporting the release of 23 Pakistanis who had been arrested under the Amin regime. The government took the step with the object of showing good will and its desire to improve relations with Pakistan.

The statement emphasizes that the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan hopes that the relations between the two countries would improve and all disputes would be settled through friendly talks and sincere efforts from both sides.

EGYPTIAN, PRC COOPERATION NOTED; INDIAN PAPER CITED

LD182250 Moscow TASS in English 1548 GMT 18 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Beirut, January 18, TASS--Addressing the People's Assembly, Egyptian Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Ghali officially admitted that "Egypt and China are coordinating efforts on Afghanistan." According to reports reaching here, Ghali stressed, the "fruit of this coordination will become known" soon. The Egyptian authorities are known to have given the Afghan mercenaries the opportunities to undergo combat training in Egyptian camps under the guidance of Egyptian instructors and promised to supply them with weapons via Pakistan.

Delhi, January 18, TASS--The newpaper STATESMAN points out that the United States acting in close cooperation with China has been engaged in subversive activities in Afghanistan since the very first days of the Afghan revolution--since April 1978. There are considerable proofs of the fact that Washington and Beijing had given and continue giving financial and military aid to gangs of mercenaries staying in Pakistan's territory.

AFRO-ASIAN SOLIDARITY COMMITTEE WELCOMES AFGHANS' VICTORY

LD192125 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 19 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, January 19, TASS--The Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee has made a statement, welcoming the victory of the friendly Afghan people at the new stage of the April revolution. The national patriotic forces with the support of the broad popular masses, the document stresses, struck a blow on plans of imperialists and their accomplices to stop Afghanistan's advance along the lines of national independence, sovereignty and social progress.

The Soviet people fully support the policy of the Soviet Government aimed at rendering all-round support to the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, including in repelling external aggression, the assistance which was given at the request of the Government of Afghanistan, in full accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Soviet-Afghan treaty of friendship, goodneighbourliness and cooperation.

The Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee expresses confidence that the just cause of the Afghan people shall triumph, that the joint forces of peoples will thwart imperialist plans aimed at splitting the united front of the national liberation forces.

PRC FOREIGN MINISTER'S PAKISTAN VISIT VIEWED AS 'INSTIGATORY'

LD211900 Moscow TASS in English 1824 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, January 21, TASS--Huang Hua, Chinese minister of foreign affairs, who is now in Pakistan, made a provocative trip to the Pakistani-Afghan border. Visiting the camps of so-called Afghan refugees, camps which are being used as bases for the training of military formations of bandits that are infiltrated into Afghanistan. At a meeting with the leaders of the bands of mercenaries, he assured them that China will give them unlimited aid and support. During the stay at the border, as is reported from Peshawar, the Chinese visitor behaved so arrogantly as if he were back at home in some Chinese province, and not in the territory of the sovereign country.

The Chinese minister's instigatory visit to the mercenaries' bases against the background of growing deliveries of Chinese, U.S. and British arms to Pakistan is an indication that a strategic plan with regard to that country has been elaborated and is being implemented with a view to draw it into the dangerous course of antagonism with neighbours and of heightening tension in South-West Asia.

On his arrival in Islamabad Huang Hua said that his visit took place right after the talks of U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown in Beijing and in the wake of the trip by the British foreign secretary, Lord Carrington.

So, we are faced with a tri-partite conspiracy which makes no secret of who stands behind the aggressive forces acting against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan from the Pakistan territory.

This is pointed out, in particular, by the British DAILY TELEGRAPH which writes--commenting on Huang Hua's visit to Pakistan--that according to information "a joint strategy" is being worked out towards Afghanistan and the whole region during the talks between the Chinese minister and President Ziaul Haq. In this connection foreign observers note that Pakistan might find itself alone in paying back to its neighbours for "the joint strategy" prepared by the Chinese. The Pakistan territory is being ever-more widely used for subversive anti-Afghan activities. The responsibility falls not only with Washington and Beijing but also with the Pakistan Government which does not stop these activities, but, on the contrary, is encouraging them in different ways.

Washington's and Beijing's dangerous plans to use Pakistan for their own purposes arouse the concern of the Pakistani public and the press. The weekly VIEWPOINT writes editorially that the leadership of Pakistan should not allow the country to be turned into a pawn in the big game which has been started around the events in Afghanistan. Pakistan should not blindly follow the prompting of the West and Beijing which launched a noisy campaign about the "Afghan question" which they themselves created. The weekly points out that it is essential for Pakistan to work out its own foreign policy line to promote the establishment and development of goodneighbourly relations with all the countries of the region.

Touching upon the attempts by high-ranking visitors to bully Pakistani figures with an mythical "Soviet threat" the viewpoint stresses that Pakistan should maintain good relations with the Soviet Union and resume contacts with the new Government of Afghanistan as soon as possible.

JOURNALISTS INTERVIEW INDIRA GANDHI ON RELATIONS WITH USSR

LD221012 Moscow TASS in English 0946 GMT 22 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Delhi, January 22, TASS--"The Soviet Union is a loyal friend on India. It helped us in economic development and supported our position on many major international problems. It has always helped the Afro-Asian countries in their struggle for freedom", said Premier Indira Gandhi. Interviewed by Soviet correspondents on the eve of the great national holiday--the 30th anniversary of the Republic of India, she said: We have much in common in our views. It is common knowledge that the Soviet Union helped India building steel mills of tremendous significance for self-sufficiency of the developing country. In many other spheres it also showed understanding when we were in a difficult situation and when many other countries were against us. That is why we value the friendship with the Soviet Union.

I have the warmest and most pleasant recollections of my visits to the Soviet Union and also of the return visits of Soviet leaders and various Soviet delegations, she said. Each such visit strengthens our relations. You know, that my father, Jawaharlal Nehru, was the architect of our foreign policy. It was precisely he who laid the foundations of the friendship of India and the Soviet Union and we but follow in his footsteps, Indira Gandhi emphasized. Our foreign policy is undoubtedly the policy of non-alignment. That is why we look at various problems from the viewpoint of our national interests. Of course, we are very pleased when they coincide with the interests of the other great country thanks to which we can be friends.

For the Soviet people I entertain greatest admiration, the prime minister next said. They achieved tremendous successes and progress. More than once I have seen this for myself. During each visit to the Soviet Union I saw for myself how they are advancing. The whole world is aware of their successes in science, technology and the advance of national culture in the republics. I believe that all this deserves every praise. Soviet people have always displayed greatest friendship to me.

YUGOSLAV-USSR COOPERATION BELIES CLAIMS OF SOVIET THREAT

LD190056 Moscow in Macedonian to Yugoslavia 1800 GMT 18 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Various information services in the West have in recent days been reporting fabrications about relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. Here is what our commentator, Yuriy Nikolayev, writes in this connection:

The forms of Soviet-Yugoslav relations are various and wide. They are expressed through constant contact at the party, state and social levels and through dynamic ties in the economic and cultural spheres. There is full justification to say that our cooperation is steady and continuous. Let us look at some facts: The most important field of cooperation is material production. With the aid of the Soviet Union, Yuriy Nikolayev writes, some 120 industrial and other enterprises are being built in Yugoslavia and 60 of them have already been put in operation. For example, last November one of the largest complexes in Europe for bauxite processing [word indistinct] began production with full capacity. As is know, it was designed by Leningrad engineers and is equipped with Soviet machinery installed with the help of Soviet workers.

Yugoslav organizations also participate in the construction of a series of projects in USSR, and more precisely, in large hotels in Moscow, Sochi and Yalta. Enriched by new forms, the mutually advantageous trade cooperation between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia is developing dynamically. The goods trade between our countries has doubled during each 5-year plan, which speaks for itself. In the period 1976-1980 the volume of trade is to increase nearly two and half times and will reach over $14 billion. The foreign trade is being expanded by adding new varieties of goods, new kinds of raw materials, for example. Thus a pipeline is put into operation to carry natural gas from the USSR to Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia has also started exporting to Soviet enterprises some 600,000 tons of aluminum annually.

One must note that the quantitative growth of our trade is being accompanied by qualitative changes. In addition, an increasing place in our trade is being taken by goods produced in the framework of specialization and cooperation. The volume of cooperated industrial production is to quadruple in this 5-year plan. Scientific and technological ties between our countries are quite important; a program is being prepared now on bilateral contacts in the field of science and technology for the period 1980-1985, and on the basis trends of scientific and technological cooperation until 1990. It gives priority to most efficient ways, like the setting up of joint scientific-technological groups, exchange of documentation, symposiums and summer schools.

Other forms of Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation are the contacts between the CPSU and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. These ties are a solid basis for the further development and deepening of relations between our countries. In this connection the meetings held between Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and Josip Broz Tito take an important place. As is known, in recent years there were several such meetings in Moscow and Belgrade and at various international forums. The Soviet people remember, for example, Comrade Tito's visit to our country in May last year. Also last year a delegation of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia National Assembly visited the USSR led by its speaker, Dragoslav Markovic. There were also visits by a delegation of the Macedonian Assembly, parliamentarians from Slovenia and a delegation from Vojvodina.

One can see that these and many other facts about our daily ties prove that the relations between our countries are characterized by a constant striving for varied and all-round contacts and for deepening cooperation. The differences of approach to some international questions can by no means throw a shadow on this fundamental approach. That is precisely what those in the West, who are kindling a new campaign and thus attempting and not for the first time--to harm relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia--cannot or will not understand. The authors of these fantastic fabrications are trying to attribute to the Soviet Union some anti-Yugoslav designs. But such fabrications by the enemies of socialism are not something new; as far back as November 1976, during his visit to Yugoslavia, Comrade Brezhnev said: It has become fashionable in some Western circles to denigrate our good bilateral relations and to spread various stupid fabrications about them. The authors of such stories are attempting to describe Yugoslavia as a [word indistinct] defenseless Red Riding Hood threatened with being eaten up and swallowed by a hungry bad wolf--the aggressive Soviet Union. I don't know, Comrade Brezhnev continued, what is hidden behind such fabrications--absolute lack of understanding of the principles of relations between the socialist countries or a cynical belief that the public would swallow any lie when it is being persistently repeated for a long time.

It seems that the same belief is inspiring the present perpetrators of a new, slanderous campaign who are ignoring the fact that the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia are building their relations on the basis of deep mutual understanding, full equality, mutual respect, trust and absolute noninterference in each other's internal affairs. We are united by historical, age-old traditions of ddep mutual understanding and friendship, of brotherhood cemented with the blood of the best sons of our peoples shed in the joint heroic struggle against fascism during World War II. We are united by communist solidarity and internationalism.

RUSAKOV ADDRESSES BULGARIAN CP CONFERENCE ON PARTY TIES

LD181649 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jan 80 p 4 LD

[TASS Report: "Conference in Sofia"]

[Text] Sofia, 16 January--A conference on questions of developing friendly relations at the level of local CPSU and Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] organs was held here 15 and 16 January. It was opened by G. Filipov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the BCP Central Committee. Reports on tasks in further improving and strengthening cooperation were delivered by D. Stanishev, secretary of the BCP Central Committee, and K.V. Rusakov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Taking part in the conference were G. Atanasov and M. Mishev, secretaries of the BCP Central Committee, and representatives of the two parties' central committees and republic, kray, oblast, city, okrug and commune committees, the All-National Committee for Bulgarian-Soviet Friendship, and also central leadership organs of social organizations and certain Bulgarian ministries and departments.

A broad, comradely exchange of experience of work on the fulfillment by local party organs of the tasks stemming from the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and the 11th BCP Congress took place during the conference. Its participants exchanged opinions on further developing and deepening cooperation and increasing its efficiency and effectiveness. The main directions of relations were considered, their content and forms were analyzed, and specific recommendations were made for further improving cooperation.

The meeting between representatives of the two parties was held in the spirit of traditional cordial friendship and fraternity.

ZHIVKOV PRESENTS ORDER OF DIMITROV TO RUSAKOV

LD181635 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jan 80 p 4 LD

[TASS report: "Award Presentation"]

[Text] Sofia, 16 January--T. Zhivkov, first secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council, has presented K.V. Rusakov with the Order of Georgi Dimitrov conferred on him for his contribution to developing and deepening comprehensive cooperation between Bulgaria and the Soviet Union and in connection with his 70th birthday.

PATOLICHEV, BULGARIAN FOREIGN TRADE MINISTER DISCUSS ECONOMIC TIES

LD181003 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 5 LD

[TASS report under the general headline "Official Reports"]

[Text] A meeting took place 14 January between USSR Foreign Trade Minister N.S. Patolichev and Bulgarian Foreign Trade Minister Kh. Khristov. Questions of the further development of trade and economic relations between the two countries were discussed.

USTINOV GREETS JARUZELSKI ON WARSAW LIBERATION ANNIVERSARY

LD181517 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Jan 80 p 1 LD

[Text] To Army Gen W. Jaruzelski, Polish minister of national defense.

Esteemed Comrade Minister!

On behalf of the USSR Armed Forces and on my own personal account, I send you and all servicemen in the Polish People's Army fraternal combat greetings and cordial congratulations on the 35th anniversary of Warsaw's liberation from the fascist German occupiers.

The joint participation of the Soviet Armed Forces and the 1st Army of the Polish Army in liberating Warsaw is a shining page in the annals of Soviet-Polish combat collaboration and in the history of our peoples' struggle against the common enemy.

On this noteworthy day I wish you, Comrade Minister, and all Polish servicemen new successes in combat and political training in the interests of further strengthening the defense capability of Poland and the socialist community countries.

With communist greetings,

[signed] Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Ustinov, USSR defense minister.

FRENCH NATIONAL ASSEMBLY CHAIRMAN ARRIVES IN MOSCOW

LD211741 Moscow TASS in English 1447 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, January 21, TASS--"I came to Moscow as a true follower of General de Gaulle's ideas, as a man who wants nothing to disrupt the development of relations between France and the Soviet Union", Jacques Chaban-Delmas said on his arrival in the Soviet capital today. He was invited by the chairmen of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet--the country's parliament. The chairman of the French National Assembly noted in a TASS interview that "the difficulties currently existing in the world give an additional reason to come here and discuss topical matters".

Kozlov Commentary

LD211416 Moscow TASS in English 1335 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, January 21, TASS--TASS commentator Aleksandr Kozlov writes:

President of the French National Assembly Jacques Chaban-Delmas is due to arrive on an official visit in Moscow today at the invitation of the chairmen of both chambers of the Supreme Soviet--the USSR parliament. On the program of his stay are meetings and tasks with statesmen as well as a tour of the country. Thus, in particular, he is to visit the city of Baku, the capital of Azerbaijan, a Soviet republic in the Transcaucasus, is the sister city of Bordeaux, whose mayor is Jacques Chaban-Delmas. The speaker of the National Assembly is paying his visit within the framework of the Soviet-French parliamentary ties, which are of a regular character and are developing successfully. The parliaments of both states permanently exchange delegations. These meetings enable MPs to get to know each other better and regularly exchange views on various issues.

Such permanent contacts help towards building up confidence between the Soviet and French peoples, broadening all-round cooperation between the two countries. Soviet-French business ties, which are built on the basis of a long-term program are mutually-beneficial, stable and designed for a long-term, are developing fruitfully. French firms take part in the construction of industrial complexes in the USSR and Soviet ones--in the construction of industrial projects in France. At present more than 650 French firms are successfully cooperating with the Soviet Union. As far as trade is concerned, its volume has doubled in recent years alone. Scientific-technical cooperation between the two countries is carried out on a large scale. Much experience has been accumulated by Soviet and French specialists who are engaged in joint work for outer space exploration. Cultural ties between the two countries are also successfully developing. Last year, France was visited by thousands of Soviet artistes, singers, musicians and dancers. In their turn, French artistes were on guest performances in Soviet cities. A fresh evidence of the fruitful development of these ties is the protocol on cooperation in the field of cinematography for 1980-81 signed between the two countries last week.

Soviet-French cooperation covers very many fields of life of the two countries. Soviet-French ties based on the traditions of friendship and reliable partnership accord with the vital interests not only of the USSR and France, but also of the entire mankind. They can serve as a model of mutually advantageous relations of states with differing social systems.

FRANCE, USSR SIGN CINEMATOGRAPHY PROTOCOL

LD181606 Moscow TASS in English 1540 GMT 18 Jan 80 LD

[Excerpt] Moscow, January 18, TASS--"A protocol on cooperation in cinematography in 1980-81 is a fresh testimony of the successful development of cultural links between our countries, the links which meet the mutual interests of our peoples, help them know each other better", a TASS correspondent has been told in an interview by Pierre Viot; general director of the national cinema-centre of France. He heads a delegation to the session of the Mixed Soviet-French Commission for Cooperation in Cinematography, which was held for 2 days in Moscow and was crowned by the signing of the protocol. From the Soviet side it was signed by Filipp Yermash, chairman of the USSR Cinematography Committee.

PONOMAREV MEETS WITH BELGIAN CP DELEGATION

LD191114 Moscow TASS in English 1048 GMT 19 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, January 19, TASS--A delegation of the Communist Party of Belgium--members of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Comunist Party of Belgium Jan Debrouwere and Augustin Duchateau stayed in Moscow on January 15-19 at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

The Belgian comrades had a meeting with alternate members of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Boris Ponomarev.

The representatives of the CPSU and the Communist Party of Belgium briefed each other on activities of their parties and exchanged opinions on some matters of the international situation of mutual interest. They expressed concern over the aggravation of the international situation, caused by the recent NATO decision on the production and deployment of new American missiles in Western Europe. In this connection the representatives of the CPSU and the Communist Party of Belgium emphasized the need of new initiatives for strengthening peace and security in Europe and the necessity to intensify the struggle for detente and for an end to the arms race. The meeting was held in a comradely, businesslike atmosphere.

CUNHAL SUPPORTS SOVIET POSITION ON AFGHANISTAN

LD182156 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 18 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Alvaro Cunhal, general secretary of the Portuguese Communist Party, has welcomed Soviet aid to Afghanistan. Speaking in the parliament he noted that that had been extended in connection with the growing threat to the republic from imperialism.

BREZHNEV SENDS CONGRATULATIONS TO NEW SWISS PRESIDENT

LD161950 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1750 GMT 16 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Leonid Ilich Brezhnev has sent Georges-Andre Chevellaz a telegram congratulating him on his election as president of the Swiss Confederation. The telegram conveys very best wishes to the president, the Federal Council and the people of Switzerland. In a reply telegram, the president of Switzerland expressed thanks for the congratulations and conveyed personal best wishes to Comrade Brezhnev and the Soviet people.

TUDEH PARTY PAPER CALLS FOR 'REVOLUTIONARY VIGILANCE'

LD212200 Moscow TASS in English 2058 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Tehran, January 21, TASS--Iranian public voices serious alarm in connection with the new plots hatched by internal and external reaction against the Iranian revolution.

The arrest of 20 officers--plotters in the air force base in Tabriz, writes newspaper MARDOM, organ of the Tudeh Party of Iran testified to the fact that similar centres of counterrevolution can well exist in other areas since in the army and in the state apparatus--despite the appeals from the democratic forces--no consistent purge was effected following the revolution to rid the state apparatus of former officials of the shah secret police SAVAK and other supporters of the former regime. The newspaper stresses that counterrevolution in Iran enjoys moral, financial and military support of U.S. imperialism.

One of the trusted persons of the deposed shah, General Oveisi, writes MARDOM, organized last week in the United Kingdom a counterrevolutionary rally at which he said that the United States has given the opponents of the present regime of Iran a one hundred percent green light for subversive activities against the Iranian revolution. Oveisi also pointed out that he had 10,000 armed people outside Iran, ready to stage such actions which will be supported inside the country by the supporters of the shah regime.

The organ of the Tudeh Party of Iran has again addressed itself to the competent authorities with an appeal to publish lists of former SAVAK officials and to embark on a resolute purge in the army and in the state apparatus in order to eliminate anti popular elements. At the same time the party appealed to the population to increase revolutionary vigilance.

REVOLUTION GUARDS ORDERED TO MOVE FROM IRANIAN KURDISH TOWNS

LD212216 Moscow TASS in English 2125 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Tehran, January 21, TASS--The Islamic Revolutionary Council of Iran ordered the units of "the Guards of the Islamic Revolution" to leave the towns of Sanandaj and Mahabad situated in Iranian Kordestan. The decision was taken on a recommendation of the special government mission recently sent to Kordestan. Responsibility for the maintenance of order in these towns has been vested with civilian police.

IRAN-AMERICAN SOCIETY IN SHIRAZ CLOSED

LD212358 Moscow TASS in English 2115 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Tehran, January 21, TASS--The Attorney General of the Islamic Revolution 'Ali Qoddessi announced over Tehran Radio the disbanding of the Society for Iranian Cultural Relations with the United States in the town of Shiraz.

The statement of the attorney general points out that Washington is using every means in trying to restore its position in Iran lost as a result of the revolution. However, the Iranian people will never permit U.S. imperialism to implement under the guise of developing "cultural ties", its colonialist designs, 'Ali Qoddessi stressed.

PDRY, USSR SIGN PROTOCOL ON GOODS EXCHANGE FOR 1980

LD211936 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0930 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Aden, January 21, (TASS)--A protocol on goods exchange in 1980 between the USSR and the PDRY has been signed here during a visit to the PDRY by a Soviet delegation led by I.T. Grishin, deputy minister of foreign trade.

The protocol provides for a considerable increase, compared with last year, in deliveries of Soviet goods including consumer goods. The South Yemen side, in its turn, will increase the export of its traditional goods to the USSR.

During the talks between the Soviet delegation and Finance Minister Mahmud Sa'id al-Mahdi and Trade and Supply Minister Ahmad 'Ubayd al-Fadli, the two sides discussed prospects for further development of cooperation in trade, including prospects for a long-term agreement on goods exchange between the USSR and the PDRY.

CONFERENCE OF SOLIDARITY WITH ARABS ENDS; STATEMENT ADOPTED

LD220750 Moscow TASS in English 0610 GMT 22 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Tripoli, January 21, TASS--The first session of the international follow-up secretariat of the World Congress of Solidarity with Arab Peoples came to a close in the Libyan capital. The participants in the session considered and approved a program of actions for 1980.

They adopted a statement sharply condemning the As-Sadat regime's anti-popular policy and its course towards turning Egypt into U.S. imperialism's military base aimed at suppressing national-liberation movements in the Middle East and spearheaded first of all against the struggle of the Arab people of Palestine. The statement emphasizes that As-Sadat's collusion with the USA and Israel is creating a serious threat to the vital interests of the Arab peoples and to the interests of universal peace and security.

The international secretariat resolutely came out against Washington's aggressive aspirations in the area of the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean and emphasized that U.S. actions pursue the aim of consolidating U.S. imperialism's dominance over this vast area and its oil resources.

The international secretariat's statement expresses a serious concern over U.S. provocative actions with regard to Iran and other countries of the region and over U.S. interference in the internal affairs of African states.

The secretariat called on the world public at large to be vigilant against Washington's aggressive aspirations which are creating a threat to universal peace, the cause of detente and which are leading to an intensification of the arms race and to a return to cold-war times.

VANGUARD WORKERS PARTY NEEDED IN ETHIOPIA

LD191358 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 17 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Our observer Vladimir Kostin examines prospects for the establishment of a vanguard workers party in Ethiopia:

A national democratic revolution can develop only if the mass of the working people who carry it out have clear-cut goals in the ideological, economic, social and cultural spheres. Setting such goals is not an easy task. It requires a deep theoretical knowledge, experience, and devotion to the revolutionary ideals. In other words, to define the tasks and goals of the national democratic revolution stage by stage there should be a vanguard party consisting of politically educated and mature progressives. Once the immediate and long-term goals of the revolution have been set, the mass of the people can proceed to implement them. In order for their actions to be really effective the people should be mobilized, organized, taught, inspired and led. This is another major function of a vanguard workers' party. While the national democratic revolution in Ethiopia was in its initial stage, with its task of abolishing the feudal regime and crushing resistance by reactionaries, adequate guidance would be provided by such a revolutionary body as the Provisional Military Administrative Council. Later on the Ethiopian leaders proclaimed the country is socialist-oriented, in accordance with the vital interests of the mass of Ethiopians.

Socialism, however, can only be built, even conditions for building socialism can be created, only on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, the theory of scientific socialism. So as soon as Ethiopia proclaimed itself to be socialist oriented it became necessary for its various Marxist-Leninist organizations to merge into a single vanguard party, capable of giving political and ideological guidance to the Ethiopian workers in their struggle for socialism. Efforts to create such a party are already in progress. Calls for setting a Marxist-Leninist party at the head of the Ethiopian revolution have come from trade unions, farmers' associations and associations of city residents, from youth and women's organizations, military and progressive (?associations). A center for the formation of a vanguard workers party has been set up, headed by the chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council, Mengistu Haile Mariam.

COMMENTATOR DISCUSSES 'SOCIALIST-ORIENTED' AFRICAN STATES

LD191206 Moscow in English to Africa 0700 GMT 16 Jan 80 LD

[First installment of a series on socialist oriented countries in Africa by Nikolay Kosugin, "our expert on African studies," in response to listeners' requests]

[Text] First of all I would like to name the African countries that have chosen the road of socialist orientation. They are the Algerian People's Democratic Republic, the People's Republic of Angola, the People's Republic of Benin, the People's Revolutionary Republic of Guinea, the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, the People's Republic of Congo, the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, the People's Republic of Mozambique, the Republic of the Cape Verde Islands, the Republic of the Seychelle Islands, the United Republic of Tanzania and socialist Ethiopia. In Africa the socialist-oriented countries account for one-third of her territory and a fourth of the population. Socialist orientation emerged as a tendency of social development in the sixties in the course of the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and democratic revolutions in a number of African countries.

The socialist-oriented countries are in the front ranks of today's national liberation movement. You must bear in mind that there can be no equation between socialist orientation and socialism. Socialist orientation is a policy laying down the foundations for a future socialist society. There are several conditions that can be used to determine the nature of socialist orientation. The first concerns the crucial question of any revolution, that is, who forms the government and whose interests this government represents and defends. The national democratic revolution that is taking place in the socialist-oriented countries is guided and developed by representatives of the revolutionary democrats in office. They express primarily the interests of the farmers, the working class, the petty bourgeoisie and intellectuals. They are all interested in promoting their independence and profound social reforms.

A further condition deals with the attitude to foreign and local business interests. The socialist-oriented countries have passed a number of laws severely limited or abolishing domination of foreign capital. The [word indistinct] foreign property as well as the property of big capitalist owners usually constitutes the basis for the development of a state sector. For example in Algeria the power, mining and metallurgical industries are government controlled. State-run enterprises turn out 70 percent of chemical products and account for 70 percent of the volume of building. Like in Tanzania, Ethiopia, Angola and several other socialist-oriented countries, in Algeria external and a considerable part of internal wholesale trade are under state control.

One other important condition is how the progressive slogans proclaimed in a country correspond to the social and economic reforms carried out by it. It is important to see how the interests of the working people are being taken into account, the interests of the workers and farmers above all. It is essential that these two sections of society be active in running the affairs of the government and society.

Finally, important for socialist orientation is the leading role of the revolutionary democratic parties. Vanguard parties have been established in many socialist-oriented countries oriented to scientific socialism and Marxism-Leninism. These countries include Angola, Mozambique, Benin and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. Socialist Ethiopia also faces the task of (?building) a vanguard party. The attitude of progressive independent countries to world socialism is important for evaluating the process of the development of the socialist oriented countries along socialist lines. Many revolutionary democrats regard the alliance with the world socialist community as a strategic line for the development of their respective countries.

Treaties of friendship and cooperation signed, say, between Angola and this country, between Mozambique and this country, and between Ethiopia and the Soviet Union, have paved the way for further developing relations of friendship between countries and their growing solidarity in the joint struggle against imperialism [words indistinct] and of national independence and social progress.

CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE LETTER LISTS CANDIDATES, CONSTITUENCIES

LD182148 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 18 Jan 80 LD

[Text] The following is an open letter to the regional electoral commissions of the supreme soviets of union republics:

Esteemed comrades, we, the undersigned members of the CPSU Central Committee, have received from labor collectives of enterprises, kolkhozes, sovkhozes, institutions, educational establishments and military units, and also from constituency election conferences, letters and telegrams informing us that we have been nominated as candidates for deputies of the supreme soviets of union republics in a number of constituencies, and requesting us to consent to stand in those constituencies.

We express our profound gratitude and sincere recognition to the workers, kolkhoz farmers, engineers and technical workers, white collar workers, servicemen of the army and navy, to all the voters who nominated us as candidates for deputies of the supreme soviets of union republics.

We fully ascribe the high honor and trust shown in us to our Communist Party. We view this trust as proof of the inviolable unity of Soviet society, the cohesion of all Soviet people around the CPSU, the unanimous support for its domestic and foreign policies, the striving of the working people of our homeland to make the concluding year of the 10th 5-Year Plan, as defined at the November 1979 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, a year of shock Leninist work, to mark the 110th anniversary of the birth of Vladimir Ilich Lenin with new labor victories, and to successfully fulfill the tasks of 1980 and the 5-year plan as a whole.

Since each of us can only stand in one constituency, the CPSU Central Committee has recommended that we consent to stand in the following constituencies:

Brezhnev, Leonid Ilich, Baumanskiy Constituency, Moscow City, RSFSR;
Andropov, Yuriy Vladimirovich, Priokskiy Constituency, Gorkiy City, RSFSR;
Grishin, Viktor Vasiliyevich, Vishnyakouskiy Constituency, Moscow City, RSFSR;
Gromyko, Andrey Andreyevich, Kaliningradskiy Constituency, Moscovskaya Oblast, RSFSR;
Kirilenko, Andrey Pavlovich, Politekhnicheskiy Constituency, Leningrad City, RSFSR;
Kosygin, Aleksey Nikolayevich, Frunzerskiy Constituency, Moscow City, RSFSR;
Kunayev, Dinmukhamed Akhmedovich, Bakanskiy Constituency, Alma-Atinskaya Oblast, Kazakh SSR;
Pelshe, Arvid Yanovich, Krasnooktyabrskiy Constituency, Volgograd City, RSFSR;
Romanov, Grigoriy Vasiliyevich, Smolenskiy Constituency, Leningrad City, RSFSR;
Suslov, Mikhail Andreyevich, Avtozavodskiy Constituency, Kuybyshevskaya Oblast, RSFSR;
Tikhonov, Nikolay Aleksandrovich, Obukhovskiy Constituency, Leningrad City, RSFSR;

Ustinov, Dmitriy Fedorovich, Kovrovskiy Constituency, Vladimirskaya Oblast, RSFSR;
Chernenko, Konstantin Ustinovich, Kuybyshevskiy Constituency, Moscow City, RSFSR;
Shcherbitskiy, Vladimir Vasiliyevich, Bagleyskiy Constituency, Dnepropetrovskaya Oblast, Ukrain SSR;
Aliyev, Gaydar Ali Rza Ogly, (Razinskiy) Constituency, Baku City, Azerbaijan SSR;
Gorbachev, Mikhail Sergeyevich, Tsentralnyy Constituency, Altayskiy Kray, RSFSR;
Demichev, Petr Nilovich, Kirovskiy Constituency, Yaroslavl City, RSFSR;
Kuznetsov, Vasiliy Vasiliyevich, Elektrostalskiy Constituency, Moskovskaya Oblast, RSFSR;
Masherov, Petr Mironovich, Leninskiy Constituency, Minsk City, Belorussian SSR;
Ponomarev, Boris Nikolayevich, Zavodskoy Constituency, Saratov City, RSFSR;
Rashidov, Sharaf Rashidovich, Pakhtaabad Constituency, Andizhanskaya Oblast, Uzbek SSR;
Solomenstev, Mikhail Sergeyevich, Miass Constituency, Chelyabinskaya Oblast, RSFSR;
Shevardnadze, Eduard Amvrosyevich, Rukhskiy Constituency, Georgian SSR;
Kapitonov, Ivan Vasiliyevich, Podolskiy Gorodskoy Constituency, Moskovskaya Oblast, RSFSR;
Dolgikh, Vladimir Ivanovich, Novolpetskiy Constituency, Lipetsk City, RSFSR;
Zimyanin, Mikhail Vasilyevich, Zheleznodorozhnyy Constituency, Voronezh City, RSFSR;
Rusakov, Konstantin Viktorovich, Proletarskiy Constituency, Rostov-on-Don City, RSFSR.

We request the constituency commissions for the elections to the supreme soviets of union republics to consider this letter as a document of registration for candidates as deputies: Brezhnev, Andropov, Grishin, Gromyko, Kirilenko, Kosygin, Kunayev, Pelshe, Romanov, Suslov, Tikhonov, Ustinov, Chernenko, Shcherbitskiy, Aliyev, Gorbachev, Demichev, Kuznetsov, Masherov, Ponomarev, Rashidov, Solomentsev, Shevardnadze, Kapitonov, Dolgikh, Zimyanin, Rusakov.

[Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 21 January reports that the following have been registered as candidates for republican supreme soviets: Kuznetsov, Kapitonov, Gorbachev, Zimyanin, Dolgikh, Rusakov, Ponomarev, Solomentsev, Demichev, Macherov, Rashidov, Shevardnadze and Aliyev.]

Brezhnev, Kosygin Candidacy Registration

LD191438 Moscow TASS in English 1403 GMT 19 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, January 19, TASS--The current election campaign in the USSR entered a new important stage. The registration of candidates to stand for election to the supreme soviets of the union republics began today.

The first candidates nominated by Soviet people are the leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet state.

Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has been nominated a candidate by the whole people. This is a manifestation of the immense love, gratitude and immeasurable respect which he enjoys among Soviet people as continuer of the cause of Lenin. This is the people's tribute of gratitude for his many-faceted titanic activities to ensure the economic and social prosperity of the Soviet Union, to strengthen its defence potential and strengthen peace.

A meeting of the Electoral Commission of the Baumanskiy Electoral District for elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, in which Leonid Brezhnev gave consent to stand for election, took place in Moscow today in a ceremonial atmosphere.

The proposal to register Leonid Brezhnev as candidate from this district was ardently supported on behalf of the participants in the district election conference and the collectives of enterprises and organisations by all speakers at the meeting. The decision to register Leonid Brezhnev as candidate for the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation from the Baumanskiy Electoral District of Moscow was adopted unanimously.

The electoral commission of the Fruzenskiy Electoral District of the Soviet capital registered Aleksey Kosygin, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, as candidate for the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation from this district.

Meetings of electoral commissions took place in many districts. The participants in the meetings adopted decisions to register workers, collective farmers, scientists, party and state leaders as candidates to stand for election.

Brezhnev Speech

LD211126 Moscow TASS in English 1114 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, January 21, TASS--Leonid Brezhnev has been today presented the certificate of candidate for election to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation in the Bajman Constituency of the city of Moscow.

Chairman of the district electoral commission, who presented the certificate, stressed that the working people of the district in common with all Soviet people have received with great enthusiasm and gratitude Leonid Brezhnev's consent to stand for election for the Supreme Soviet of the republic in the Bauman Constituency. The working people of the district are taking now additional socialist commitments in order to mark the day of elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, the 110th anniversary of V.I. Lenin's birth with new labor successes.

Receiving the certificate, Leonid Brezhnev said:

I was glad to meet you. Please convey my sincere gratitude to the collectives of the computer factory, of the plant of automobile and tractor electrical equipment and Moscow's Bajman Higher School of Technology that have nominated me candidate to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

More than four years have passed since the previous elections. What kind of years were they? There were, certainly, difficulties and setbacks. But on the whole these were good years, rich in remarkable events.

We are confidently forging ahead along all the main directions of the activity of the party and the people. About 1,000 new industrial enterprises were built in our country. They include enterprises that are unmatched in the world. Much has been done also for the development of agriculture. The real per capita incomes of the population increased by almost 14 per cent over four years.

Socialists democracy has been developed further. The new Constitution reliably ensures the rights of the Soviet people, protects their dignity.

The Soviet Union's international positions have become firmer. This year we shall be marking the 35th anniversary of the victory. And, certainly, it is a great achievement that we have safeguarded peace.

I am to meet the voters rather soon. Then I shall be able to dwell at greater length on the results of the past years both in the internal and international affairs, to speak about the party's plans for future.

In conclusion, I would like to assure you that I shall do everything to live up to the trust of the voters.

[Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1030 GMT on 21 January adds:

["Present at the presentation of the certificate were Grishin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom; Kupreyev, first secretary of the Moscow Baumanskiy Raykom; and Guskova, political agent for candidates for election to the Supreme Soviet and mechanic and welder in the Shestidesyatiletiya Oktobrya vehicle and tractor electrical apparatus plant."]

KIRILLIN RELIEVED OF SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDIUM DUTIES

ID220948 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0939 GMT 22 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, 22 January (TASS)--The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has relieved Vladimir Kirillin of his duties as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministries and chairman of the State Committee of the USSR for Science and Technology, in accordance with his request.

NIKOLAYEV APPOINTED UKRAINE MINISTERS COUNCIL DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

AU211108 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 15 Jan 80 p 1 AU

[Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium decree appointing N.F. Nikolayev as Ukrainian Council of Ministers deputy chairman]

[Text] The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium resolves to appoint Comrade Nikolay Fedorovich Nikolayev as deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers.

[Signed] A. Vatchenko, chairman, and Ya. Kolotukha, secretary of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Kiev, 14 January 1980.

Born in 1922, N.F. Nikolayev is a mine building engineer and has been a CPSU member since 1949. During the Great Fatherland War he was in the Soviet Army and participated in the fighting against the German fascist oppressors. After being discharged from the army, he worked at a plant in Chelyabinsk in 1944-47, and after graduating from the Donetsk Industrial Institute he worked as a senior engineer, chief of the Mine Building Administration, chief of the Mine Administration and deputy chief of the Sakhtersk Anthracite Trust. In the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee apparatus since 1956, he was a sector chief and a department chief. Since 1968, he was chief of the Heavy Industry Department.

Comrade N.F. Nikolayev is a Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee member and a Ukrainian Supreme Soviet deputy.

Burmistrov Retirement

AU211109 Kiev PRAVDA Ukrainy in Russian 15 Jan 80 p 3 AU

[Text] The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium has relieved Comrade A.A. Burmistrov of the duties of Ukrainian Council of Ministers deputy chairman in connection with his retirement on pension.

NEW KAZAKH MINISTER OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS APPOINTED

AU181707 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 1516 GMT 18 Jan 80 AU

[Text] Today the Kazakh Supreme Soviet Presidium in a decree appointed Andrey Georgiyevich Platayev as Kazakh minister of foreign affairs.

The Kazakh Supreme Soviet Presidium has relieved Makan Yesbulatov of the duties of Kazakh minister of internal affairs in connection with his transfer to another job.

BACKGROUND TO UZBEK FORESTRY MINISTER'S DISMISSAL REPORTED

LD211339 [Editorial Report LD] Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian on 4 January 1980 carries on page 4 a 2,300-word article by A. Samigulin and S. Sergeyev entitled "A Nasty Story" which provides the background to the dismissal of Uzbek SSR Forestry Minister S. Tairov. The story concerns the activities of two ministry employees: R. A. Kaipov, chief of the Control and Auditing Department, and his accomplice O. K. Losskiy, Ministry Collegium executive secretary. The report describes how Kaipov "swanned" round forestry stations "pretending to be working hard" but in fact threatening people and accusing them of theft and of squandering funds, falsifying his reports accordingly. He was joined in his activity by Losskiy, and their "incorrect attitude" was soon causing perplexity among the other employees, the report says.

It goes on to describe a complaint lodged by a female employee about their "unseemly behavior," and gives a detailed account of the lengths that Kaipov and Losskiy went to suppress criticism and punish their critics.

The "unhealthy atmosphere" in the ministry developed because "unseemly work style and methods" had become established and were "supported by Forestry Minister M. Tairov," the report says. He had "opened the doors of an important state institution to dishonest people" and, despite their "soiled" reputations, had "given them his blessing." Moreover, he had "participated in the compilation of documents discrediting honest working people." To these misdemeanors the report adds the fact that Tairov had had his house and adjoining land fixed up at state expense.

ARMENIAN SSR SUPREME COURT DISCUSSES JUVENILE CRIME ISSUES

LD181015 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 11 Jan 80 p 2 LD

[Text] ARMENPRESS--An Armenian SSR Supreme Court Plenum has been held. Discussing judicial practice in cases of juvenile offenses, the Armenian Supreme Court Plenum pointed out that on the whole courts are insuring that legislation applying to these categories of cases is being properly enforced.

At the same time, the plenum pointed out, there are shortcomings in the work of courts which are reducing the effectiveness of judicial work to combat juvenile offences. A number of courts are not complying in full with the law of procedure, which determines the conditions and procedure for the examination of cases, do not always observe the principle of taking individual circumstances into account when fixing punishments, and fail to follow up cases in which the preliminary investigative organs do not enforce the law on adult's criminal responsibility for having involved young people in criminal or other antisocial activities.

The Supreme Court plenum drew courts' attention to the need to insure that judicial work is of a standard which will help as much as possible to successfully solve the tasks of preventing and eradicating juvenile crime and to educate minors in the spirit of unswerving compliance with Soviet laws and respect for the rules of a socialist community.

The plenum instructed courts to strictly observe the requirements and provisions of the law concerning judicial procedure in juvenile cases, to constantly improve the quality of proceedings in such cases and the standard and educational value of judicial proceedings, and to strive to insure the effectiveness of preventive work. The plenum also examined the question of judicial practice in civil housing cases.

LATE REPORT: SAKHAROV DEPRIVED OF TITLES, ARREST RUMORED

LD221426 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1405 GMT 22 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, January 22, TASS--The following TASS statement is published in today's issue of the newspaper IZVESTIYA: "For a number of years Andrey Sakharov has been carrying out subversive work against the Soviet state. In connection with this he was warned on more than one occasion of the inadmissibility of such activities by representatives of competent organs of authority, public organizations and prominent Soviet scientists. Ignoring the warnings Sakharov has lately embarked on the path of appealing openly to the reactionary circles of imperialist states to interfere in the internal affairs of the USSR. Taking into account the numerous proposals made by the Soviet public, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has deprived Andrey Sakharov of the title of Hero of Socialist Labor and of all state awards, and the USSR Council of Ministers has deprived him of the titles of winner of the USSR prizes which had been awarded to him."

[Paris AFP in English at 1327 GMT on 22 January adds: "An anonymous caller speaking in Russian telephoned several Western correspondents here today to report that dissident Soviet physicist Andrey Sakharov has been arrested. The report has not been confirmed, but newsmen who went to Mr Sakharov's apartment building today found the front door blocked by police. A policeman on guard said that a search was being carried out on the first floor of the building (Mr Sakharov lives on the seventh), and the dissident had not been arrested. Telephone calls to Mr Sakharov's number rang out briefly, and then were replaced by an engaged signal. The anonymous caller who claimed that Mr Sakharov had been arrested said that "they" would return in two hours to take away his wife."]

PRAVDA APPEALS FOR GREATER EFFICIENCY IN POWER INDUSTRY

LD181317 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 80 p 1 LD

[Editorial: "Energy and Saving"]

[Text] Soviet people have entered the concluding year of the 10th 5-Year Plan armed with a clear-cut action program elaborated by the CPSU Central Committee November (1979) Plenum and the USSR Supreme Soviet session. The course set toward the preferential development of key sectors of the national economy is based primarily on the rapid growth of power generation. Accelerating the country's electrification under present conditions is one of the main factors in increasing production efficiency and improving the life and daily routine of millions of people.

In our country the world's largest fuel and energy complex has been created. In the first 4 years of the present 5-year plan alone over 40 million kilowatts of power capacities have been commissioned. The country's power stations generated 1.2 trillion kilowatt-hours of energy last year. This is more than was generated in the entire Sixth 5-Year Plan. Our power industry is being retooled in a plan-governed manner on a modern technical basis. Power units of 500,000 and 800,000 kilowatts have long been in operation. A unit of 1.2 million kilowatts is being installed at the Kostroma GRES--that is, two DNEPR hydroelectric power stations in a single unit. The world's largest hydroelectric units are being commissioned one after another at Siberia's hydropower stations. Nuclear power stations are being installed on a broad front, and electricity generation at nuclear power stations will increase 33 percent this year alone.

These impressive successes cannot, however, cover up the blunders which still occur in the development of the energy complex. Speaking at the CPSU Central Committee November (1979) Plenum, Comrade L.I. Brezhnev rightly criticized energy project construction workers for delaying the installation of special purpose thermal power stations in East Kazakhstan and above all in the Ekibastuz coalfield, and for the fact that the Kansk-Achinsk, Kuznetsk and Ekibastuz fuel and energy complexes' capacities are being assimilated only slowly. The task has been set of accelerating their development in order to transfer energy from the eastern regions to the center of the country along super-high-voltage DC power lines.

At the same time the CPSU Central Committee plenum raised a number of long-term problems. The planning organs, scientists and designers must be thinking now about the power of the future. The long-term plans must provide for extensive construction of fast-neutron reactor nuclear power stations and develop work on controlled thermonuclear fusion and the use of solar and geothermal energy.

Our country's growing economy requires daily concern for the uninterrupted supply of energy to all sectors of the national economy and the population, particularly now, in the cold winter period. This makes it is essential to bring all power units constructed in the fourth year of the 5-year plan up to their planned level. On the other hand, it is essential to repair equipment at existing stations in good time. Much here depends on efficient work by enterprises of the ministries of power machine building and the electrical equipment industry, which must supply stations more fully with equipment and spare parts.

The uninterrupted operation of GRESes and TETses which generate the bulk of electricity, is determined to a decisive degree by their reliable provision with good-quality coal, gas, fuel, oil, peat and shale. [paragraph contines]

Stocks of solid and liquid fuel at power station and district heating plant depots were considerably below the planned level as of the beginning of the year. The fuel sector and rail transport workers are called on to eliminate the lag immediately and to establish a proper rhythm for deliveries.

The most important state task for all sectors and for every enterprises and construction site is to conserve energy and fuel. That is why it is necessary to replace obsolete, excessively energy-intensive equipment more rapidly, to use energy-saving processes more extensively, and to increase the thermal stability of installations, and apartment blocks. Many industries, above all the energy-industry workers themselves, have accumulated good experiences of a careful attitude toward fuel and the rational utilization of electricity. The labor collectives of the Sredne Uralsk, Kostroma, Reftinskaya and Troitskaya GRESes set an example to others here. If all other thermal stations assimilate the best experience, this will make it possible in the concluding year of the 5-year plan to reduce average unit fuel expenditure to the planned level of 327 grams per kilowatt-hour of electricity generated.

The targets of the sector's workers this year are high but entirely realistic. The construction and installation workers must commission 14.5 million kilowatts of new capacities. This is considerably more than were commissioned last year. To cope successfully with the plan it is necessary in the very first weeks of the year to adopt high-speed methods of installing projects following the example of the construction workers of the Nurek and Sayano-Shushenskaya GESes and to establish constructive cooperation among all those taking part in building new facilities.

In practice it is people who implement any plan. Only well organized work and effective collaboration among subcontractors, a high level of responsibility for the matter in hand, and the communists' personal example bring success. The party organization at the site where a huge new power unit is being constructed at the Kostroma GRES is making skillful use of the experience of the "Sayansk community." Over 40 subcontracting enterprises and organizations have signed a contract and joint commitments here. A coordination council has been created at the construction site and has been joined not only by economic leaders but also by party committee secretaries. The Kostromskiy and Leningradskiy CPSU obkoms constantly keep the council's work in view. All this helps to organize the construction and installation of the giant unit efficiently.

The power industry and power construction workers' socialist competition which, in the year of the 110th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's birth, is being held under the slogan "All power projects must be commissioned!" is acquiring new scope at many other construction sites. This will make it possible to fulfill even more successfully the 25th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee November Plenum decisions on accelerating development in the energy sphere.

PRAVDA CALLS FOR MANAGEMENT REFORM IN CONSTRUCTION SECTOR

LD211047 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jan 80 p 1 LD

[Editorial: "Improving Construction Management"]

[Text] Capital construction is one of the leading components of the economy. The main emphasis in its development is today shifting to intensive economic management methods and increasing production efficiency. [paragraph continues]

As the CPSU Central Committee November (1979) Plenum pointed out, there are tremendous potential and tremendous reserves for this. But in order to make maximum use of them, the work of all the economic mechanism will have to be improved and a flexible organizational structure created according with the scale and tasks of the construction complex.

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution "On Improving Planning and Intensifying the Economic Mechnism's Impact on Raising Production Efficiency and Work Quality" paid much attention to capital construction. In accordance with the 25th party congress decisions, it is planned to transfer this sector to the two- and three-tier management system--which will make it possible clearly to demarcate leadership organs' rights and duties, simplify their structure, bring them closer to production and improve efficiency and flexibility in their work.

General management schemes are now being elaborated in construction ministries and departments. In this complex and crucial work creative use should be made of the experience of industry, where such schemes were created several years ago. Much that is valuable has been accumulated in the practice of the automotive, chemical and electrical equipment industries and power machine building. There, intermediate tiers have been eliminated and enterprises have been merged into big production and science-production associations. It is precisely that kind of management structure that contributes to raising efficiency and work quality and meets the demands of technical progress. Much has already been done in this direction in collectives of the Ministry of the Construction of Oil and Gas Industry Enterprises.

Associations will be the main financially autonomous components in construction. USSR Gosstroy recently approved a statute defining their structure, tasks, rights and duties. Construction and installation associations are granted extensive independence, and their initiative must be directed toward production concentration and specialization, fuller utilization of the achievements of science and technology and leading experience, and raising labor productivity in every possible way. These collectives' work will be assessed, as the resolution on improving the economic mechanism envisages, according to end-results--completely finished projects handed over to clients. Ministries and departments are now called upon to prepare the general management schemes more rapidly and implement them actively.

In improving the construction management system, it is important to avoid repeating the mistakes seen in industry. For instance, often only the titles of structural elements were changed, while their essence remained the same. Draft general schemes have not taken enough account of the interests of comprehensively developing economic regions, and local organs have not always supported proposals for merging small production facilities into big associations. Construction ministries must resolutely combat phenomena of this kind, boldly surmount psychological barriers and suppress localist and departmentalist tendencies.

As the experience of the first construction associations has shown, they come up against considerable difficulties. For instance, such an association began operating in Kaliningradskaya Oblast at the beginning of last year. It incorporated 20 independent administrations and mobile mechanized columns. But many of them retained their independence. This complicated planning, finance and accounting. A proposal to merge subunits was not supported by local organs. That kind of approach to creating associations must receive a principled assessment from party and planning organs and USSR Gosstroy.

Any innovation almost always involves breaking established traditions and habits. It is a question of making a definite shift in the thinking of economic leaders and specialists. Whatever post he may hold, the Soviet engineer must constantly master management science, enlarge his economic knowledge and display a party approach to work. A tremendous responsibility for selecting and placing cadres when the new management system is being introduced lies with local party committees and Construction Ministry and department party committees and collegiums. To skillfully select association leaders and specialists is to create the preconditions for successful work by the main element in production.

The present state in improving capital construction management must result in an appreciable improvement in work in this important national economic sector. Increased attention must be paid to industrializing and mechanizing jobs, extensively assimilating leading working methods, and utilizing internal reserves and progressive techniques. The experience of the collectives of Orel, Tallinn, Vilnyus, Leningrad and Moscow is evidence that financially autonomous design and construction systems [konveyery] are capable of this. The creation of housing, and also industrial, design and construction associations is worth considering.

The process of improving construction management demands special attention and active participation from party organizations. Their direct duty is to create in collectives an atmosphere of high exactingness and a creative approach to construction organization and to help to promote enterprising specialists to responsible positions. Party committees are called upon to step up the attention paid to checking the implementation of party and government resolutions and to heighten cadres' responsibility.

In resolving the problems of improving management, it is important at the same time to direct collectives' efforts toward successfully completing the 5-year plan construction program and to create for each collective favorable conditions for fulfilling the plans and pledges. This will be a good basis for confident work in the 11th 5-Year Plan, when the new economic management mechanism will start operating at full capacity.

PARTY, STATE LEADERS ATTEND CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION CONFERENCE

ID182206 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 18 Jan 80 ID

[Text] A conference on capital construction matters was held at the CPSU Central Committee today. It examined matters connected with improving the whole business of capital construction in the light of the November 1979 CPSU Central Committee Plenum decisions and of the provisions and conclusions set out in the speech by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev at the plenum. Taking part in the conference were Gorbachev, Politburo candidate member and CPSU Central Committee secretary; Ponomarev, Politburo candidate member and CPSU Central Committee secretary; Kapitonov and Dolgikh, party Central Committee secretaries; deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; ministers of the USSR; secretaries of the central committees of the communist parties of the union republics, and secretaries of CPSU kraykoms and obkoms.

A report on the results achieved in 1979 and on the planned measures for fulfilling the construction plans in the current year was given by Dymshits, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. A speech was delivered at the conference by Kirilenko, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary. Great work has been done in construction in the past 4 years of the 5-year plan period. More than R500 billion worth of capital investment have been concluded. About 1,000 large industrial enterprises have been put into operation.

A considerable part of the basic assets has been renovated. More than 420 million square meters of residential floor space, many schools, hospitals, children's preschool establishments and other installations designed for social use have been constructed.

In 1979 new large capacities for the generation of electricity, for the extraction and processing of iron ore, coal, oil and gas, for the smelting of steel and for the production of mineral fertilizers were created. An increment in capacities was secured in the machine construction industry and in the light and foodstuff branches of industry. The length of main railroad track and pipelines has increased. Large funds have been invested in the further development of the material-technical base in agriculture.

At the conference particular attention was drawn to the fact that there continue to be serious shortcomings in capital construction. Last year's tasks for the handing over for use of production capacities in a number of industries of the national economy and also the plans for the construction of residential floorspace and installations for cultural and consumer purposes have not been fulfilled. Criticized in this connection were a number of leaders of ministries and departments who had tolerated the dissipation of capital investment and an increase in incompleted construction work and who had not taken resolute measures to concentrate manpower and means at projects at the commissioning stage.

The conference noted that in the current year the tasks facing collectives of construction and installation organizations and of industrial enterprises are sharply increasing. The commissioning of new large capacities in all industries of the national economy has to be insured and residential houses covering a total area of 109 million square meters and many other installations of a social purpose have to be constructed. The conference pointed out that the fulfillment of this program requires that the efforts of economic and party organizations and of all builders be immediately concentrated on insuring that production capacities of primary importance for the further development of our economy and for increasing the well-being of the Soviet people be brought into service. Stressed at the conference was the need to spread the initiative of construction collectives who had mounted competitions to bring into service capacities and installations at a commissioning stage ahead of schedule, to meet the 110th anniversary of the birth of Vladimir Ilich in a worthy manner and to successfully fulfil the plan and socialist pledges of the concluding year of the 5-year plan period.

GRISHIN ADDRESSES MOSCOW MEETING ON SOCIALIST COMPETITION

LD212125 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Summary] A joint meeting of the Moscow Gorkom Bureau, the Moscow Gorispolkom, the Presidium of the Moscow City Trade Union Council and the Bureau of the Moscow Komsomol City Committee today summed up the results of socialist competition between Moscow enterprises in the fourth quarter of 1979 and the results of 1979 as a whole. "While noting the successes in labor collectives, at the same time participants in the meeting spoke plainly about shortcomings in the work of various sectors and outlined measures to eliminate these shortcomings. A speech was delivered at the meeting by Grishin, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom."

GRISHIN ATTENDS MOSCOW CONFERENCE ON ENERGY CONSERVATION

LD170948 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 17 Jan 80 LD

[Summary] Economies, thrift and competition were considered today at a conference of Moscow's industrial, construction, transport and municipal workers.

"The participants in the conference made specific proposals aimed at raising exactingness towards observance of state discipline in power consumption and the rational utilization of fuel and electricity in every production sector. Those taking part in the work of the conference included Grishin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom."

ROMANOV ATTENDS LENINGRAD AKTIV MEETING ON 1980 PLAN TARGETS

LD180941 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 17 Jan 80 LD

[Text] At the Smolnyy today there was a meeting of the aktiv of party, administrative, economic, trade-union and Komsomol organizations. It discussed the results of work during the past year and the tasks which have to be carried out by Leningraders to successfully fulfill the plan for the final year of the 5-year plan period. There is to be a further development of industry, agriculture and construction in Leningrad and Leningradskaya Oblast. Over 200 production units, workshops and sections will be comprehensively mechanized and automated and over 300 progressive technological processes assimilated. Some 600 models of new machines, instruments and equipment and over 3,000 new consumer products are to be produced.

The spakers also talked of labor gifts for the Lenin anniversary. A number of turbines, generators and ships will be constructed ahead of schedule. Personal 5-year targets will be fulfilled by 150,000 workers by 22 April. The meeting discussed fulfillment of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee November Plenum and Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's advice and recommendations. It also discussed as yet unused reserves. Socialist pledges for 1980 were adopted. They are a generalization of the stepped-up plans and intensive pledges adopted by labor collectives.

Romanov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the party's Leningradskiy Obkom, took part in the meeting.

IZVESTIYA VIEWS PROBLEMS IN SIBERIAN RIVER TRANSPORT

LD181019 [Editorial Report LD] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 January 1980 Morning Edition carries on page 2 a 1,600-word article under the rubric "Integrated Development for the Eastern Regions" entitled "Jams on Siberia's Rivers" and written by P. Drachev, deputy chief of the West Siberian Steamship Line, and IZVESTIYA correspondent L. Levitskiy. The article discusses various shortcomings in the West Siberian river transport system, including the slow growth of river transport enterprises and port facilities, lack of coordination among all types of transport and the inadequacy of the existing river fleet. The authors call for greater rationalization and restructuring, in particular merging the three steamship lines now operating in the Ob-Irtysh basin into one authority. The article concludes by stressing the potential of hovercraft both for passenger and freight transportation in the area.

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

RADIO REPORTS AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 18-20 JANUARY

LD210435 [Editorial Report LD] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 18 and 20 January. Times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item:

18 January

In Altayskiy Kray nearly 1 million tons of seeds have been prepared. About 3 million hectares will be sown this year to particularly valuable varieties of spring wheat. (0700 GMT)

In Tselinogradskaya Oblast this year agricultural workers are planning to sell the state over 2 million tons of grain, including 85 percent of this in strong and hard wheat varieties. To date snow retention has been carried out on over half the area. (1600 GMT)

20 January

Much snow has fallen this winter in Volgogradskaya Oblast. Moisture retention has begun as well as application of fertilizers. Over 1 million tons of organic fertilizers have been taken out to grainfields and corn and vegetable farms. Farmers are planning to dress the soil with another 4 million tons, which will significantly increase yields. (1200 GMT)

(Gennadiy Petrovich Zhilov), deputy head of the USSR Seed Sorting Directorate [Sorsemprom], in an interview states that the plan for sowing winter crops generally has been overfulfilled nationwide. Almost 4 million hectares more of winter grain have been sown than in 1978. In the RSFSR between 95 and 100 percent of the seeds have been brought up to sowing standards. At the same time work connected with preparing seeds for spring grain crops has been delayed in Kazakhstan, Georgia, Azerbaijan and, in particular, in Smolenskaya, Kirovskaya, Gorkovskaya, (?Orel), Ryazanskaya, Kostromskaya and Tulskaya oblasts. The necessary conditions for highly efficient operation of drying units have not been created in the sovkhozes and kolkhozes in these oblasts. (2115 GMT)

OFFICIAL INTERVIEWED ON LONG-TERM CREDITS FOR STATE FARMS

LD182304 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 18 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, January 18, TASS--Credit assistance of the state to agricultural production cooperatives (collective farms) ensures their planned development independent of temporary difficulties due to climatic conditions, Ivan Chirkin, head of the Finance Department of the Ministry of Agriculture of the USSR, told a TASS correspondent. Last year's scorching drought reduced the receipts of many agricultural estates. However, not a single one of the 26,000 collective farms of the country decided on curtailing previously planned amounts of construction, purchases of new equipment or seeds.

Last year, Ivan Chirkin said, collective farms received more long-term credits than at any time in the past; 4.5 billion roubles. A major part of this money went into building cattle raising farms, increasing the herds and the development of fodder base. Over a billion roubles is being spent to purchase new equipment. Around 200 million roubles has been earmarked for building a system of irrigation and land reclamation. All these measures will strengthen the production base making it less dependent on climatic conditions.

The specific feature of the line of credit opened by the Soviet state for its agriculture, head of the Finance Department of the ministry explained, is that it is given on highly favourable conditions. The banks open lines of credit for 20 years at an annual fixed interest of only 0.75 percent. The credit policy on the part of the state is dictated by its concern for speeding up the agricultural production. That is why, despite last year's difficulties, the collective farms, strictly in accordance with the previously charted programme, are allocating this year for capital construction the biggest amount of money in recent years: 10.5 billion roubles. Almost a half of the amount will be covered by long-term credits.

A systematic increase in the amount of credits has largely contributed to strengthening the material and technical base for the cooperatives. While at the beginning of the 1976-1980 five year period the main production funds (capital goods) of the collective farms amounted to 86.5 billion roubles, at present their value has exceeded 100 billion roubles.

The collective farms are also actively using short-term credits at an annual one per cent interest.

Ivan Chirkin reminded that labour remuneration is guaranteed in Soviet collective farms. Each collective farmer draws a monthly wages [as received] for the work done. If the collective farm feels a shortage of liquidity for the wages fund, a bank gives the collective farm a short-term credit without delay.

It goes without saying, however, that the guaranteed remuneration does not cover all the incomes of the collective farmers. If production plans are fulfilled or overfulfilled, all the agricultural workers get a bonus which is proportionate to their labour inputs. This bonus comes from the profit of the collective farm.

Thanks to this system of remuneration the workers of cooperatives get this material incentive which stimulates them to increase the efficiency of their labour and to do their utmost to increase the output of agricultural products. By its credit policy, the state actively assists them. By giving its financial assistance, it contributes to the creation of such material and technical conditions in the collective farms when each agricultural worker becomes increasingly independent of the whims of nature, Ivan Chirkin stressed in conclusion.

SOLOMENTSEV SPEAKS AT RSFSR AGRICULTURE MINISTRY COLLEGIUM

LD202346 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2050 GMT 19 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Results of the past year and the tasks connected with developing the republic's agriculture in 1980, in light of the decisions of the November 1979 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and instructions contained in Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's speech at the plenum, were examined at the extended session of the RSFSR Agriculture Ministry collegium. Minister Florentyev delivered a report. Solomentsev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, spoke at the session. The collegium has decided to concentrate the attention of the collectives of kolkhozes and sovkhozes on finding and using internal reserves to increase production of grain, meat, milk and other produce, on a rational and highly efficient utilization of all material and labor resources.

Florentyrev Interview

LD192150 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 19 Jan 80 LD

[Summary] A conference of management workers of RSFSR agriculture is being held in Moscow today. In an interview L. Ya. Florentyrev, RSFSR minister of agriculture, spoke in general terms of the tasks facing agricultural workers at the present stage.

The main task is to increase production and procurement of grain. Good work was achieved during the autumn; the area sown to winter crops was increased by almost 4 million hectares in the republic. Most of this is now in good and satisfactory condition. The RSFSR annual plan envisages raising total grain harvest to 134 million tons, but this is the minimum requirement.

At the start of this year the numbers of all types of animals are higher than at the same time last year. Measures are being taken to increase fodder production. This and other measures will allow an increase in the sale of meat to the state by a minimum of 400,000 tons, milk by 1.5 million tons, and eggs by 3 billion, compared with the average annual indexes for the 4 years of the 5-year-plan.

Higher Output Discussion

LD212324 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 21 Jan 80 LD

[Summary] A conference of leaders of agricultural organs of the Russian Federation has ended in Moscow. Its participants discussed ways in which output can be significantly increased this year. It is planned to harvest no less than 140 million tons of grain crops from the fields of the republic.

The area sown to winter crops, most of which are now in good or satisfactory condition, has been increased by 4 million hectares. Active preparations for spring sowing are now underway. Production of such crops as rye, buckwheat, millet, corn for grain crops and soya will be increased.

Measures which will make it possible to increase the output of livestock breeding in the republic have also been examined. According to specialists' calculations, these measures will make it possible to increase the sales of meat by 400,000 tons and of milk by 1.5 million tons, relative to the average annual figures obtained over the 4 years of the current 5-year plan. The conference focused much attention on improving the quality of produce and storage facilities. Measures aimed at the further social development of the countryside were reviewed.

PRAVDA EDITORIAL OUTLINES TASKS FOR RURAL WORKERS

LD141603 [Editorial Report LD] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 9 January 1980 frontpages a 1,200-word editorial under the headline "High Targets for Rural Workers." The editorial summarizes last year's results in agriculture and goes on to note the role of "growing material and technical resources" in "resolving the food problem." It notes the increasing "economic efficiency" of agricultural production and states in particular that "improving the efficiency of stockraising requires special attention," noting the importance of the successful wintering of livestock. The editorial outlines the tasks which lie ahead in "preparations for the new harvest" for grain and other crops, and concludes by stressing the role of rural party organizations.

PLEKHOV SUMMARIZES USSR DEFENSE POLICY

LD181715 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Jan 80 pp 2-3 LD

[Article by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences Docent Capt A. Plekhov under the rubric "Leninism and the Epoch": "Unity of Scientific Theory and Revolutionary Practice"]

[Excerpts] The preparations underway in our country for the 110th anniversary of V.I. Lenin's birth are one more vivid demonstration of the Soviet people's boundless love for their teacher and leader and of their unshakable loyalty to his behests. This is a further review of the triumph of Lenin's teaching and its growing influence on the course of world social development. Lenin's immortal ideas are being persistently implemented by the CPSU--the living embodiment of the indissoluble unity of scientific theory and revolutionary practice. The Marxist principle of not only explaining the world but also changing it was and still is one of the basic principles of the CPSU's activity.

The successes of communist building are determined not only by the internal factors of our society's development but also depend on external conditions. Our party devotes very close attention to international problems.

The central place in the CPSU's theoretical activity is occupied by the further elaboration of principled questions of the development of the world socialist system and by joint generalization of the experience accumulated by the socialist community countries. The common natural laws of socialist building have been specified on the basis of a scientific analysis of this experience, as have also the natural laws of the development of the community of fraternal socialist countries and of the deepening and broadening of the process of socialist economic integration.

The Leninist principle of proletarian, socialist internationalism is consistently realized in the USSR's foreign policy. The CPSU and the Soviet state have done and are doing everything possible to strengthen the socialist countries' unity and cohesion, to give assistance and support to peoples struggling against imperialism, neocolonialism and racism, to strengthen peace and international security, to end the arms race and to secure disarmament.

On the basis of an in-depth scientific analysis of the trends of world development and of the correlation of forces in the international arena the CPSU put forward the peace program and is struggling persistently to implement it. The theory and practice of our party's foreign policy activity are characterized by immutable loyalty to the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems.

This policy of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist countries encounters the fierce resistance of reactionary imperialist circles. They are stepping up actions against detente, seeking to change the correlation of forces in their favor and building up the arms race. This is evidenced by the broad militarist program advanced in the United States and by the decision adopted at the NATO December session to deploy medium-range missiles in certain West European countries.

Cold war phraseology and spirit permeated U.S. President J. Carter's speech on American television 4 January this year. The substance of that speech and the steps announced by the U.S. administration in the sphere of Soviet-American relations can only be evaluated as hostile to the interests of peace.

China's leadership acts as the direct accomplice of imperialism. It pursues a great-power, hegemonist policy hostile to the cause of peace and socialism.

In this situation the CPSU and the Soviet state have been forced to strengthen their country's defense capability and its armed forces. In resolving complex defense questions they are guided by Lenin's teaching on defending the socialist homeland.

On the basis of this teaching there has been elaborated in our country a harmonious system of views on the essence and content of modern wars, on the methods and forms of modern military actions, on the principles and main directions of Soviet military building, personnel training, preparation of the USSR Armed Forces and so forth. The CPSU's military policy, whose essence is everything for effective defense and nothing in excess of that, takes accurate account of the objective laws of military building and of the whole range of internal and external factors influencing the forms, methods and means of resolving defense tasks. On the basis of an analysis of them the CPSU draws up comprehensive programs and plans for the country's economic, scientific, technical, ideological and strictly military preparation to repulse aggression.

Unity of theory and practice in the defense sphere is embodied in the state of the Soviet Armed Forces today. In terms of their technical equipment and organizational structure and their control and support systems they are equal to modern demands and their historical purpose. All their building is conducted on the basis of the latest achievements of scientific and technical progress.

The strengthening and improvement of our armed forces is a complex, comprehensive, creative process, in which there is and can be no room for stagnation.

These days the socialist competition is spreading in the army and navy, as it is throughout the Soviet land. It is proceeding under this motto: Sacredly fulfill Lenin's behests, improve combat and political training, increase vigilance and be always ready to defend the motherland and socialism's great gains. Personnel are fully resolved to make 1980 a year of shock Leninist work in the name of the triumph of the cause of communism.

All the CPSU's efforts are subordinated to the cause of communist building. It honorably fulfills the role of combat vanguard and political leader of the working class and the entire Soviet people. Marxism-Leninism constitutes the theoretical base of its policy. The further development of scientific theory and its unity with revolutionary practice are a very important condition for successfully resolving creative tasks and defending socialism in the process of the onward ascent toward the highest phase of communist formation.

AIR FORCE COUNCIL STRESSES POLITICAL, LABOR ACTIVENESS

LD181731 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Jan 80 p 2 LD

[Lt Col A. Volkov report: "Strengthening Labor Discipline"]

[Text] A session of the Air Force military council discussed the question of further increasing the political and labor activeness of workers and employees of the Soviet Army. The report of Lt Gen Avn N. Tsymbal and the speeches of Comrades N. Chukardin, S. Glamazdy and V. Skubilin stressed the need to step up ideological and political work in labor collectives and to create an atmosphere of high political activeness and responsibility on the part of every working person for production efficiency and product quality.

The military council analyzed in detail the state of the work of commanders, political organs, staffs and trade union organizations in the light of the 25th CPSU Congress decisions and the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU resolution "On Further Strengthening Labor Discipline and Reducing the Turnover of Cadres in the National Economy." It was noted particularly at the military council that it is necessary to improve organizational and political education work in labor collectives in every way by directing it toward strengthening labor discipline and eliminating losses of working time. This work must be regarded as a main direction in improving production efficiency and cultivating a communist attitude to labor.

The military council outlined concrete measures to improve ideological and political education work in labor collectives.

The military council session was addressed by Chief Marshal of Aviation P. Kutakhov, the air force commander in chief, and Col Gen of Aviation I. Moroz, member of the military council and chief of the Air Force Political Directorate.

MONTH OF MASS DEFENSE WORK BEGINS

LD181250 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 18 Jan 80 LD

[Text] An all-union month of mass defense work is starting in our country. By tradition it is organized just before Soviet Army and Navy Day. This time it is also devoted to the 35th anniversary of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War. In connection with the beginning of the month a festive soiree will be held in Moscow today.